

BACONIANA.

VOL. II. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1904.

No. 6.

"ENGLISH LITERATURE" UP-TO-DATE.

"**E**NGLISH Literature" is advancing by leaps and bounds, thanks mainly to the efforts of Mr. Edmund Gosse and Dr. Garnett, who have published four large volumes entitled "English Literature: An Illustrated Record," their criticism ranging over the wide period which they style, "From the beginning" to "The age of Tennyson."

According to the Publisher's announcement, "the authors have never lost sight of the benefit accruing from the presentation of a scrupulously exact history, combined with attractive and amusing qualities. (!) Life-long study devoted to movements in, and the progress of, English Literature places the writers in a position to offer a history on entirely new lines."

Dr. Garnett revels in "the fanciful might-have-beens so largely indulged in by Shakspeare's biographers"—the words are those of Mr. F. G. Fleay—and he does his best to show that Mr. Asquith was not far wrong when he stated that "Few things are more interesting to watch than the attempts of scholars and critics to reconstruct the life of a man at once so illustrious and

so obscure as the greatest of our poets." Dr. Garnett believes thoroughly in Mr. Asquith's *dictum* that the work of a Shakespeare biographer is "not so much an Essay in biography as in the, more or less, scientific use of the biographic imagination," and he carries out this belief in admirable fashion in his latest production—the second volume of "English Literature: An Illustrated Record."

Mr. Sidney Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, which, according to its author, "reduced conjecture to the smallest dimensions," and in which he said he was unable to promise his readers "any startling revelations"—although he did not keep the promise—is eclipsed by the "revelations" of Dr. Garnett.

Mr. Lee cautiously says:—"The suggestion that he [Shakspeare] joined, at the end of 1585, a band of youths of the district in serving in the Low Countries under the Earl of Leicester . . . is based on an obvious confusion between him and others of his name."

What Mr. Lee refers to is evidently the story that there was sent home to Leicester's wife a letter, which was misdelivered, *per* the actor in the Low Countries known as "Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player." We have the names of the principal actors in the Leicester Company, and unfortunately for Dr. Garnett, the name of Shakspeare is not found in the Lowlands programme. The "Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player," could only by a huge stretch of imagination be made to apply to Shakspeare. "William Kemp"—the Elizabethan comedian—was a member of Leicester's Company; and we have yet to learn that "William Shakspeare" was doubtless the "jesting player" referred to, as we know that Shakspeare's characters were the "ghost" in *Hamlet* and "Adam" in *As You Like It*. Not much scope here for a comic actor! Could, then, "Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player," be

William Shakspeare? It appears improbable, if not impossible.

But Dr. Garnett rushes in where Mr. Lee is afraid to tread, and boldly states :—

“The year 1585 is that in which Shakespeare disappears from observation. Leicester was the great lord of his part of the country, to whose protection he would naturally have recourse. A band of youths from Warwickshire [?] did, we know, follow Leicester, and few Warwickshire youths can have had more cogent reasons for making one of their number than William Shakespeare. . . . Leicester took a company of actors with him to the Low Countries, and Shakespeare may have been of the number of it, but it is quite as likely that he served in some other capacity. Without question the new scene which would open upon him, the magnificent shows and triumphs with which Leicester was received, the view of tented fields and leagues, the daily talk of war and statescraft—the association with all sorts and conditions of men, would go far to bestow that knowledge of good society, and create that easy and confident attitude towards mankind which appears in Shakespeare’s Plays from the first, and which are so unlike what might have been expected from a Stratford rustic or a London actor.”

These are certainly new “facts” in the life of Shakspeare!

According to the biographers, Shakspeare, in 1585, was working in Stratford, and did not leave Stratford till 1586. Dr. Furnivall goes further, and says: “His (Shakespeare’s) father being thus in fresh difficulties, and Shakespeare himself probably not prosperous, ‘The Queen’s Players’—not known to be Burbage’s, or the company with which Shakespeare is always connected—came for the first time to Stratford in 1587, and this was probably the turning-point in Shakespeare’s life. At any rate, sooner or later (after 1587, be it noted), he left his birth-town for London, and took the way to fame and fortune.” “No doubt,” Dr. Furnivall adds, “he (Shakespeare) could then, in 1587,

have been taking his M.A. degree." According to Dr. Garnett, however, there was one thing which prevented him doing this, as two years previously he had started playing with Leicester's actors on the Continent! And in 1589—two or, at most, three years after Shakspeare left Stratford—Leicester's men produced a play called *Hamlet*, which Charles Knight, Richard Grant White, Howard Staunton, Mr. F. G. Fleay, and other commentators maintain was the work of Shakspeare, who in 1586 had been a butcher's apprentice at Stratford, and had just come from Stratford to London with the manuscript of *Venus and Adonis* in his pocket! One thing is certain, Shakspeare, in spite of his "miraculous and universal intuition," could not be both in Stratford and in the "United Provinces" at the same time. "Miraculous" as Shakspeare was, he could scarcely accomplish this feat. And another thing is equally certain, Shakspeare never wrote *Hamlet* three years after he left Stratford.

We are told that Shakspeare, the actor, picked up all his "classical knowledge" in London after he left Stratford. If he spent so much time with Leicester's company on the Continent *after* leaving Stratford (according to Dr. Garnett), how did he manage to acquire all the "classical knowledge" which Mr. Churton Collins recently showed in *The Fortnightly Review*? Shakspeare had made himself master of on his transference to London? If we accept Mr. Churton Collins, it is perfectly clear that we must pitch Dr. Garnett overboard. Both cannot drive in harness together. Each must go with single bridle.

But, perhaps, Dr. Garnett, with some more "probabilities," can reconcile Mr. Churton Collins and Dr. Garnett, and tell us how Shakspeare was acting in Germany while he was employed in felling sheep and oxen for his father, at Stratford, and at the same time

writing *Venus and Adonis*, when the deer were scarce in Sir Thomas Lucy's park. Not content with sending the actor to the Low Countries, Dr. Garnett supposes that the actor must also have been a "schoolmaster" when he wrote *Love's Labour's Lost*—1588, according to Dr. Furnivall! He was actor, lawyer's clerk, and schoolmaster simultaneously!

Mr. Sidney Lee distinctly controverts Dr. Garnett's theory of "practical experience" for what Shakspeare wrote. Shakspeare needed no "practical experience." According to Mr. Lee:

"The knowledge of a soldier's life which Shakespeare exhibited in his plays is no greater and no less than that which he displayed of almost all other spheres of human activity, and to assume that he wrote of all or of any from practical experience, is to underrate his intuitive power of realising life under almost every aspect *by force of his imagination.*"

The italics are mine, not Mr. Lee's.

Then Dr. Garnett states:—

"To suppose Shakespeare's dramas, Bacon's philosophy, and Bacon's politics to be the simultaneous operation of a single brain is to credit the human mind with higher powers than it possesses."

I fail to see Dr. Garnett's argument. The operations of the dramas and the philosophy and politics were not "simultaneous"—they were successive. Read Bacon's *Letters and Life* by Spedding, and you will find that the published fruits of Bacon's labour—labour which Spedding cannot explain—were ten small *Essays*. What was he doing when burning the midnight oil, and incurring reprimands for late-sitting-up from his Puritan mother? Spedding could not tell us—can Dr. Garnett? Surely Dr. Garnett is aware of the fact that the Shakespearean dramas were written when Bacon was unemployed and "struggling for

bread?" Does he appreciate the fact that except the *Essays* and the *Advancement of Learning*, all Bacon's works were written at the end of his life, long after the appearance of the plays? His chaplain, Rawley, says:—

"The last five years of his life being withdrawn from civil affairs he employed wholly in contemplation and studies . . . in which time he composed the greatest part of his books and writings."

Dr. Garnett has the courage to maintain:—

"It is, moreover, the case that no great lawyer has ever been a great poet. Many great poets have been brought up to the law, but one and all have renounced it as soon as they could, and no eminent lawyer has ever produced a work of high imagination."

Has Dr. Garnett ever heard of a lawyer called Sir Walter Scott? Does he mean to tell us that *Waverley*, *Ivanhoe*, *Marmion*, and *The Lady of the Lake* are not "works of high imagination?" If they were possible to Scott, why not the plays to Bacon? The cases of Scott and Bacon are entirely analogous. But Dr. Garnett will say, why did Bacon not acknowledge the plays, if he wrote them?

Dr. Ingleby says, with reference to Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*:—

"This address is eminently suggestive of the low estate of the players at that date, and the discredit which attached to the writers who supplied them with copy . . . Even Lodge, who had indeed never trod the stage, but had written several plays, and had no reason to be ashamed of his antecedents, speaks of the vocation of the play-maker as sharing the odium attached to the actor."

And what reasons did Scott give for concealing his identity as author of the novels and poems? He wrote to Ellis:—

"As I have suffered in my professional line by addicting myself to the profane and unprofitable art of poem-making, I am

very desirous to indemnify myself by availing myself of any prepossession which my literary reputation may, however unmeritedly, have created in my favour."

When urged by his friend Morritt to declare himself the author of *Waverley*, Scott replied :—

"I shall not own *Waverley*. My chief reason is that it would prevent me the pleasure of writing again. In truth I am not sure it would be considered quite decorous for me, as a Clerk of Session, to write novels. Judges being monks, clerks are a sort of lay brethren, from whom some solemnity of walk and conduct may be expected."

When Elliston, the actor, asked Scott to write a play with which to open the new Drury Lane Theatre, Scott replied :—

"Upon a mature consideration of my own powers, such as they are, and of the *probable consequences of any attempt to write for the theatre . . .* I have come to the determination of declining every overture of the kind."

Bacon could have given no better reason for secrecy: yet, surely, novel writing or dramatic writing, at the beginning of the nineteenth century was a more reputable occupation than play-writing at the end of the sixteenth?

Scott had all his manuscript copied for the printer, and his secret was kept till it pleased him to make his confession. Why was this impossible or unlikely in the case of Bacon?

Dean Stubbs once gave a good reason for Bacon's secrecy, which may be new to many :—

"There are some things in Shakespeare I almost fancy that he might have been burnt for had he been a theologian; just as certainly there are things about politics, about civil liberty, which, had he been a politician or a statesman, would have brought him to the block."

Would it not then be absolutely necessary for Bacon,

if he wrote the plays, to issue them either anonymously or in another name to avert such a calamity?

In Dr. Garnett's eulogy of Shakspeare we have such gems as these :—

(1) " Another important factor in Shakespeare's education must not be overlooked—the English Bible, which would be diligently read in school. Shylock's speech, ' When Jacob grazed his uncle Laban's sheep,' shows Shakespeare's intimate acquaintance with Scripture narrative."

Yet Shakespeare's father was brought up for not attending church, but the son, according to Mr. Sidney Lee,

" must have been a regular attendant at the parish church, and may at times have enjoyed a sermon."

(2) "' When he killed a calf,' says Aubrey, ' he would do it in a high style and make a speech.' The lad would not yet be old enough to slaughter an ox, but would be fully up to a calf."

Surely! Baconians fully admit *that* possibility in Shakspeare's Life!

(3) " Leaving the literary side of the question [Shakspeare's penmanship] out of sight, he must, as actor and manager, have continually received letters in the Italian character, and it would be surprising if he could not write what he must have been well able to read."

Shakspeare must have known the " Italian character," considering, as Dr. Garnett states, he went on " a confidential errand " to Germany and returned " by way of Venice." More Shakesperean biography! What may have been the purpose and occasion of this " confidential errand "? I do not find it mentioned by Mr. Sidney Lee.

(4) Over the " errand," Dr. Garnett, says :—

" Nothing would so well fit in with the long voyage which he certainly must have made at some time or other of his life."

Naturally, or he could never have written the sailors' language in *The Tempest*. But did Shakspeare ever see the sea? If so, let us have the date. We know that Bacon crossed the Channel several times—once in a storm, when his ship had to take refuge in Dover,—and he was more likely to be sent on a “confidential errand” when he was a member of the Paris Embassy than was the butcher's boy of Stratford.

(5) *Re* the address to the players in *Hamlet*, Dr. Garnett says:—

“No one, surely, can doubt that the writer of this scene had been in the constant habit of giving instructions to the performers. If he were Shakespeare, no question arises; but if he were Bacon?”

According to Dr. Garnett, Bacon couldn't do it, although Bacon wrote Masques and superintended their production, and in his works refers to acting and the stage over and over again.

According to Sir Henry Irving and Dr. Garnett, the man who wrote the Plays was an actor; he could not possibly be anything else, from his knowledge of “stage-craft.” Well, there is a Play called *Antony and Cleopatra*, written by this “matchless playwright,” and this Play is thus constructed:—

First Act, five scenes.

Second Act, seven scenes.

Third Act, thirteen scenes (Scene 8 consists of five lines; Scene 9 consists of four lines).

Fourth Act, fifteen scenes (Scene 1 consists of fifteen lines; Scene 10 consists of nine lines; Scene 11 consists of four lines).

Fifth Act, two scenes.

Is this the work of a practical playwright? I have seen a few plays in my time, but none of the scenes were limited to five or four lines, and none of the Acts extended to thirteen or fifteen scenes! Then, if the author of the Plays was such a supreme master of

"stage-craft," how does it come about that Kean, Phelps, Irving, and other acting managers knew so much more than the author, that they shifted about the author's scenes and language in a manner scarcely recognisable to a reader of the first Folio? Was it an actor or a philosopher who wrote the magnificent soliloquy—"To be or not to be?"

(6) Dr. Garnett writes:—

"His (Jonson's) eulogium on Drayton appears to us a thinly disguised satire."

Why not treat Jonson's eulogium on Shakespeare in the same light? Dryden does.

(7) Again we read:—

"The eccentric bequest to his wife of his second-best bed must have been explicable by some circumstance unknown to us. Could it have been Mrs. Shakespeare's marriage bed?"

Probably; but why not "Mr. Shakespeare's?"

(8) "After this it should be superfluous to dwell on the occurrence in the plays of words in the Warwickshire dialect."

A peculiarly Warwickshire word has never yet been found in all the plays.

(9) Dr. Garnett: "They (the Sonnets) tell us most about himself."

[S. Lee: "My conclusion is adverse to the claim of the Sonnets to rank as autobiographical documents."]

(10) Dr. Garnett: "Shakespeare, after his retirement to Stratford [1611], for some time regularly supplied the London theatre with two plays a year."

[S. Lee: "In 1611 Shakespeare abandoned dramatic composition."]

The only play after 1611 was *Henry VIII.* (1613).

(11) In complimenting my friend, Mr. Begley, on his book, *Is it Shakespeare?* Dr. Garnett says:—

"We can only remark that Mr. Begley's case will be much fortified when he is able to produce from Bacon's acknowledged writings lines so instinct with the innermost spirit of poetry, as

'But that wild music burdens every bough.'

Or—

'Bare ruined choirs, where late the sweet birds sang.

Bacon might be deemed capable of composing the speeches of Ulysses, but these wood notes wild!"

In a forthcoming article I shall endeavour to show, from the evidence of his prose works, that "Bacon was a poet" (Shelley), and that "the poetical faculty was great in Bacon's mind" (Macaulay). Dr. Garnett may then be convinced that Bacon was a poet, even in his prose works.

Meanwhile, I may point out that Bacon wrote the following lines, in his translation of the goth Psalm:—

"Thou carriest man away as with a tide ; .

Then down swim all his thoughts that mounted high ;

Much like a mocking dream, that will not bide,

But flies before the sight of waking eye ;

Or as the grass, that cannot term obtain,

To see the summer come about again."

Not the highest form of poetry, certainly, but very respectable verse, and quite equal to *The Phœnix and the Turtle*, or—

"Blest be the man that spares these stones,

And curst be he that moves my bones ;"

or even Milton's—

"Thy precious ear, O Lord, incline,

O hear me, I Thee pray

For I am poor, and almost pine

With need and sad decay."

The man who wrote these lines is credited with the authorship of *Paradise Lost*! Is it possible? Bacon

never descended to this level even in his translation of the Psalms.

Dr. Garnett asks for poetry from Bacon. Here are three passages from Bacon's prose works :—

“ Have you ever seen
A fly in amber, more beautifully entombed
Than an Egyptian monarch ? ”

“ Truth may come, perhaps,
To a pearl's value that shows best by day,
But rise it will not to a diamond's price
That showeth always best in varied lights.”

“ There is nothing under heaven
To which the heart can lean save a true friend.”

This is worthy of comparison with the following lines :—

“ My eldest Sister, Anne,
My Mother, being Heire unto the Crowne,
Marryed Richard, Earle of Cambridge,
Who was to Edmond Langley,
Edward the thirds fift Sonnes Sonne ;
By her I clayme the kingdome ;
She was Heire to Roger, Earle of March,
Who was the Sonne of Edmond Mortimer,
Who marryed Phillip, sole Daughter
Unto Lionel, Duke of Clarence.”

This last example is taken from the second part of *Henry VI.* as it appears in the First Folio. It reads uncommonly like Bacon's *History of the Reign of Henry VII.*, where I find such prose as this, put in blank verse form *without alteration of a single word* :—

“ There was a subtile priest called Richard Simon,
That lived in Oxford, and had to his pupil
A Baker's son named Lambert Simnell,
A comely youth, and well favoured, not without
Some extraordinary dignity and grace of aspect.
And for Simnell there was not much in him

More than he was a handsome boy,
And did not shame his robes."

I do not think that this *prose* of Bacon is much behind the *poetry* in *Henry VI.* and others of the Shakesperean historical dramas. But then Dr. Garnett has settled the business for ever when he states: "It ought to be evident that whoever the author might have been, he could not be Bacon."

GEORGE STRONACH.

NOTES ON THE STATE OF RELIGION IN SHAKESPEARE'S DAY.

TO contrast the contemporary state of religion with the writings of Shakespeare is a step towards the better appreciation of Bacon's labours "for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate."* In a recent commemoration sermon at Stratford-on-Avon, the preacher remarked that Shakespeare had uttered in his Plays sentiments so bold and heretical that had he been a theologian instead of a player, he would undoubtedly have been burnt at the stake.

One is apt to forget that religious persecution did not cease on the advent of "*That bright occidental star, Queen Elizabeth, of most happy memory;*" as a matter of fact the crimes and brutalities perpetrated by the Reformers upon their opponents probably equalled the horrors of the reign of Mary.

In their energetic determination to exterminate the abuses of the Church of Rome it is clear that the Reformers rooted up wheat and tares together; charity was "reformed" completely out of the land.

* *Advancement of Learning.*

The attempt to enforce the acknowledgment of Elizabeth as Supreme Governor of the Church in England led to numbers of parish priests throwing up or being evicted from their benefices, but the evictions of this period were trivial in comparison with the wholesale exodus caused a few years later (1583—85) by the determination of Whitgift to attain uniformity by compelling all ministers to subscribe to certain Articles of the Church of England :

"How many godly, able, painful Ministers were outed all over England, I cannot tell, but *ex ungue Leonem*, I have seen a MS. which gives an account of the names of sixty odd in Suffolk, twenty-one in Lincolnshire, sixty-four in Norfolk, thirty-eight in Essex ; which, though they seem comparatively few, yet are a great many when we consider that in Essex at that time, there was an account given of 163 Ministers that never Preach'd, only read Prayers and Homilies, and 85 more, Pluralists, Non-residents, or persons most notoriously bebaucht."*

To replace the evicted clergy was found to be impracticable, and consequently parish after parish was left abandoned and forlorn. Some authorities assert that out of a total of nine thousand benefices one half were unoccupied and unserved during Elizabeth's reign ; others place the total even higher. In a paper drawn up by Sir F. Knollys in 1584, it is asserted :—

"It is impossible to have so manye preachers as this byll (against pluralism and non-residence) doth require resydent, because there be nine thousand parishes, and *but three thousand preachers in the realme.*"†

The lack of teaching and discipline had its inevitable

* "History of Conformity, or the Proof of the Mischief of Impositions from the Experience of More than One Hundred Years." London : Printed by A. Maxwell and R. Roberts, 1681, p. 12.

† "A Book about the Clergy." J. C. Jeaffreson. Vol. II. London, 1870, p. 59.

results. Strype in his *Annals* records that the "abundance of parishes utterly destitute of ministers" led to "no small apprehension that in time a great part of the nation would become pagans."*

Sampson's "Supplicatory to the Queen" quoted in Strype's *Annals*,† sets forth that "There are whole thousands of us left untaught; yea, by trial it will be found that there are in England whole thousands of parishes destitute of this necessary help to salvation, that is a diligent preaching and teaching."

From every part of England we find similar reports of the prevailing desolation and degradation. The Bishop of Hertford wrote to Cecil in 1561 that his diocese was "a very nurserye of blasphemy, whordom, pryde, superstition and ignorance."‡ In 1583 the Bishop of St. Davids reported that there was now little popery, but that the people were "greatly infected with atheism and wonderfully given over to vicious life."§ Dr. Chaderton, of Litchfield, writes plaintively about the same time that he considers his diocese to be "the very sink of the whole realm both for corrupt religion and life."||

The dearth of clergy was unhappily in no way counteracted by mental ability.

"Of the hundred and sixteen clergymen of the Archdeaconry of London, in the year 1563, forty-two were almost Latinless, thirteen had no tincture of classic learning whatever, and four were 'indocti'—so uniformly ignorant and untrained, that their tenure of clerical offices was scandalous. . . . In the letter in which he communicated these facts to Samuel Pepys, in 1696, Edmund, then Domestic Chaplain of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and subsequently Bishop of Lincoln, observed, 'If

* Vol. I., pp. 512, 513. Oxford, 1824.

† Vol. III., Part I., p. 327. Oxford, 1824.

‡ "Domestic State Papers, Elizabeth." Vol. XVII., No. 32.

§ "State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth." Vol. CLXII., No. 29.

|| Strype's *Annals*, Vol. III., Part I., p. 35. Oxford, 1824.

the London clergy were thus ignorant, what must we imagine the country divines were?' "o

It happens that we are not left solely to the imagination. There is abundant testimony that the bulk of the country clergy were men of low caste, ignorant, and immoral. Although two out of every three Churches were abandoned, and falling into ruin, the crying want of clergy compelled the Reformers to muster together a veritable Falstaff's army of undesirables. Among them we read were "tinkers, tapsters, fiddlers, and pipers."†

Archbishop Jewel admits that many ministers were made from "the basest sort of people." Cardinal Allen characterised the Elizabethan clergy as "the very refuse of the worst sort of men." Richard Baxter‡ has provided us with an instructive pen picture of the vicious condition of affairs. "We lived," says he, "in a country that had but little preaching at all."

"In the village where I was born there were four readers successively in six years' time, ignorant men, and two of them immoral in their lives, who were all my schoolmasters. In the village where my father lived, there was a reader of about eighty years of age that never preached, and had two churches about twenty miles distant; his eyesight failing him, he said Common Prayer without a book; but for the reading of the psalms and chapters, he got a common thresher and day-labourer one year and a taylor another year (for the clerk could not read well); and at last he had a kinsman of his own (the excellentest stage-player in all the country, and a good gamester and good fellow), that got orders and supplied one of his places. After him another young kinsman, that could write and read, got orders; and at the same time another neighbour's son that had been a while at school turned minister, and who would needs go further than the

* "A Book about the Clergy," p. 286, Vol. II.

† "Holinshed's Chronicle, Elizabethan England." *Scott Library*. London, pp. 74—76.

‡ Born 1615, died 1707.

rest, ventured to preach (and after got a living in Staffordshire) ; and, when he had been a preacher about twelve or sixteen years, he was fain to give over, it being discovered that his orders were forged by the first ingenious stage-player. After him another neighbour's son took orders, when he had been awhile an attorney's clerk and a common drunkard, and tipleed himself into so great poverty that he had no other way to live. It was feared that he and more of them came by their orders the same way with the afore-mentioned person. These were the schoolmasters of my youth (except two of them) ; who read Common Prayer on Sundays and Holy-days, and taught school, and tipleed on the week-days, and whipt the boys when they were drunk, so that we changed them very oft. Within a few miles about us, were near a dozen more ministers that were near eighty year old a-piece, and never preached ; poor ignorant readers, and most of them of scandalous lives ; only three or four constant, competent preachers lived near us, and those (though conformable, all save one) were the common marks of the people's obloquy and reproach, and any that had but gone to hear them, when he had no preaching at home, was made the derision of the vulgar rabble, under the odious name of a Puritane."*

Such being the *morale* of the clergy it is not surprising that their neglected flocks behaved like savages. *Within* the Churches sacrilege and profanity ran riot. *Without* the people "pranked and pranced in their pride." "Like rats and swine" they "rested in gluttony and drunkenness," in "brawling and railing," in "wantonness," "toyish talking," and "filthy fleshliness." "It doth too evidently appear," says a contemporary observer, "that God is more dishonoured, and the devil better served on the Sunday than upon all the days in the week beside."†

In 1578 the schoolmaster of Tonbridge deplored that the greater part of Sunday was

"horriblie prophaned by divellishe inventions, as with Lords of Misrule, Morice dauncers, May games, insomuch that in some places they shame not in ye time of divine service to come and

* Quoted in "A Book about the Clergy," Vol. II., p. 185.

† See "A Book about the Clergy," Vol. II., p. 129.

daunce aboute the Church, and without to have men naked dauncing in nettes, which is most filthie."*

In 1586 the immorality in London was so awful that Bishop Aylmer, with a view to averting the wrath of God, ordered the Commination Service to be read more frequently. In 1572, it is recorded in Scotland that

"maintenance of Kirk and poor has gone to profane flatterers at court, ruffians and hirelings; the poor are oppressed with hunger, the Churches decayed for lack of clergy, the schools utterly neglected, the sacred buildings are like sheep cotes."†

So shocking grew the state of the country that on all hands the gentry became alarmed, "gentlemen of all sorts took heart; they pitied their (ejected) ministers, their wives and children," and they delivered frequent petitions to Bishop Whitgift,

"craving that in regard to the souls of the people and their own, he would accept such a subscription as the law expressly appointed, and restore the poor men, both to their preaching and livings."

To the dishonour of Whitgift "*this second means prevailed with him no more than the first.*"‡

Some of the civil authorities appear to have done what they could to remedy the terrible state of affairs, but men capable of teaching had apparently gradually ceased to exist. Anthony à Wood records in his Annals of the University of Oxford that in the year 1561 no degrees were given "in Divinity and but one in the Civil Law, three in Physic and eight in Arts." Students were so poor and beggarly that they were frequently driven to obtain a license under the Commissary Seal to wander about the country and beg for their living. The Poor Law of 1572 included in the term vagabond

* Arber Reprints, Vol. III., p. 9.

† "Social England." Traill. Vol. III., p. 557.

‡ Quoted in "The History of Conformity," 1681, p. 13.

"scholars of the universities begging without license from the university authorities."*

In addition to lack of teachers Avarice and Corruption were rampant. Bishopricks were deliberately kept empty in order that the court might absorb their revenues; "profane flatterers" added to the prevalent chaos by obtaining grants of five and sometimes six livings, and screwing profit out of them by farming them at a miserable pittance to scandalous persons.

The Edict of the Royal Commissioners ordering the destruction of all "copes, vestments, albes, missals, books, crosses, and such like idolatrous and superstitious monuments whatsoever," let loose a torrent of ribaldry, blasphemy, and sacrilege. The churches were stripped of everything stealable. Organ pipes were melted into pots and pans, and priestly vestments were cut up into stomachers for parsons' wives, or served as theatrical properties for wandering mountebanks. The expression "Hocus pocus" is a survival of blasphemous parodies of the Mass, the phrase "Hocus pocus" being a ribald caricature of the priest's words, *Hoc est corpus*, used on the Elevation of the Host. Altar stones were employed as pig-styes, or put to baser uses. Roofs were widely destroyed by being stripped of their lead, and dead bodies were thrown out of their coffins for the sake of their leaden wrappings. These infamous acts were not merely the excesses of an ignorant mob or a few frenzied fanatics. They were the duly sanctioned policy of the people's spiritual leaders. Archbishop Grindal is, for instance, particular in enjoining that "The churchwardens shall see that the altar stones be broken, defaced, and bestowed to some common use."†

* "Social England." Traill. Vol. III., p. 756.

† "Injunctions of Edmund Grindal" (1571). London: Wm. Serres.

The Dean of Durham used the stone coffins of the Priors of Durham, whom he termed "Servants of the Synagogue of Satan," as swine troughs, and the brass holy water stoups of the Cathedral as kitchen utensils. The character of too many of the Elizabethan prelates appears to have been coarse and brutal. They seem to have moulded their manners too much upon the character of Martin Luther. Luther, it will be remembered, termed schoolmen "locusts, caterpillars, frogs, and lice." Reason he denounced as the "Arch whore" and the "Devil's bride." Aristotle was a "Prince of Darkness, horrid impostor, public and professed liar, beast, and twice execrable." * We find Thomas à Bècket referred to by the Bishop of Durham as a "stinking martyr." † Bishop Bale terms the old clergy "puffed up porklings of the Pope." His love for alliterative sentences led this prelate to phrase his sentiments in villainous language. We find in his works such passages as :—

"Let beastly blind babblers and bawds with their charming chaplains then prate at large out of their malicious spirit and idle brains." ‡

Roman Catholic Bishops, in the estimation of Bishop Bale, were :—

"Two-horned whoremongers, conjurors of Egypt, and lecherous locusts leaping out of the smoke of the pit bottomless." §

The Bishop of Hereford indulged in "cholerick oaths and manifold rare upbraidings." The Bishop of Carlisle deemed Roman Catholic priests "Impes of Anti-christ." || Among the Elizabethan church leaders

* See "Pioncers of Evolution" (Clodd), p. 81. Richards, London, 1897.

† "Pilkington's Works." Parker Society. London, 1842.

‡ "Bale's Works," p. 249. § "Bale's Works," p. 249.

|| "Domestic State Papers (Elizabeth)," Vol. XVII.

were learned and enlightened men ; but, on the other hand, the demeanour of many of these Ecclesiastics arouses a suspicion that "Shake-speare" had them in his mind when he wrote :—

"Man, proud man,
Drest in a little briefe authoritie ;
Most ignorant of what he's most assur'd,
(His glassie essence) like an angry ape,
Plaies such phantastique tricks before high heaven
As makes the angels weepe." *

The editor of the Works of Bishop Bale has registered his conviction that certain of them "could not with propriety be presented to the public," but the style and sentiment of this particular Bishop were not singular or peculiar. The shouting of the captains was, almost everywhere, very shrill and very strident. Among the dialectics to be found in the religious literature of this time there abound such graceful flowers of fancy as :— "The whore of Babylon's chemise" (the surplice); "Antichrist's shyrt" (ditto); "Little Jack in the Box" (The Host); "Abbey lumbes," "Massmongers," "Apes of Antichrist" (Priests), and so forth.

The actions of the authorities towards recusants and those who failed to attend the reformed services were merciless in their severity :—

"At any moment one was liable to be arrested and hurried off before the appointed courts to be interrogated on oath as to whether or not they had been to Church ; where, when, and how often they had received the Lord's Supper, and whether they held the parson's certificate that this had been publicly done. If not, they were condemned as recusants to fines and imprisonment. . . . To know that a priest was at a certain place, and not to seize or betray him was a crime. To give him food, shelter, or money, was also a crime. To remain away from the

* *Measure for Measure*, II. ii.

services of the desolate and ruined Churches was a crime ; torture, imprisonment, and death were the punishments." *

Under the laws against recusancy acts of a hateful nature were systematically practised. The wealthier recusants were fined until they recanted, or their estates were absorbed. † They were then imprisoned or banished. Of the poorer recusants, the prisons and dungeons were "full of all sorts, old and young men, wives, widows, and maids." Batches of these unfortunates were tried at a time. On one occasion as many as 203 were condemned in the course of three days. Men and women were stripped to the waist, flogged till the blood flowed down their backs, bored through the ears with a red-hot iron, and turned adrift to swell the already frightful roll of wandering and

* "The Church under Queen Elizabeth" (Lee), Vol. II., p. 4. London, 1880.

† Even the enlightened Bacon does not seem to have regarded it as dissonant with religion and honour to "spur" recusants. In 1614 we find him writing to King James :—

"I have heard more ways than one, of an offer of 20,000*l.* *per annum*, for farming the penalties of recusants, not including any offence capital or of *præmunire*; wherein I will presume to say, that my poor endeavours, since I was by your great and sole grace your Attorney, have been no small spurs to make them feel your laws, and seek this redemption; wherein I must also say, my Lord Coke hath done his part: and I do assure your Majesty, I know it somewhat inwardly and groundedly, that by the courses we have taken they conform daily and in great numbers. And I would to God it were as well a conversion as a conformity: but if it should be by dispensation or dissimulation, then I fear that whereas your Majesty hath now so many ill subjects poor and detected, you shall then have them rich and dissembled. And therefore I hold this offer very considerable, of so great an increase of revenue: *if it can pass the fiery trial of religion and honour, which I wish all projects may pass.*"—Spedding. Vol. V., p. 102.

starving outcasts. It will be remembered that the name of Shakespeare's father was returned as that of a recusant. It appears, however, that in his case it was not a question of conscience, but coyness to appear in public "for fear of process for debt."

Punishment was sternly and swiftly dealt out to all stragglers from the narrow and frequently shifting path of orthodoxy. "The spirit of Calvinistic Presbyterianism," says Green, "excluded all toleration of practice or belief. . . . For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity."*

The Government inquisitors were authorized to use "such torture as is usual for the better understanding of the truth."† They did so, and the barbarities that followed challenge comparison with the infamies of Nero and Torquemada.

Bodies were racked, and legs crushed to pulp in "The Boot;" men were nailed to the pillory and left to free themselves by cutting off their ears with their own hands; needles were driven into the finger-tips between the nails and the flesh, and abominations too fiendish for detail were widely practiced.

Those who suffered death for their convictions were executed under revolting conditions. In 1583 two Anabaptists were burnt alive with "roaring and crying." For the offence of harbouring priests, permitting Mass to be said in her husband's house, and sending her son abroad to be educated in a foreign seminary, a lady of thirty was condemned to death in the following form:—

"Margaret Clitheroe. Having refused to put yourself to the country, this must be your sentence. You must return from

* "Short History," p. 469.

† "Domestic State Papers (Elizabeth)," Vol. CCXXX., p. 57.

whence you came, and there in the lowest part of the prison be stripped naked, laid down with your back upon the ground and as much weight laid upon you as you are able to bear, and so to continue three days without meat or drink except a little barley-bread and puddlewater; and the third day, your hands and feet being tied to posts and a sharp stone being put under your back, you are to be pressed to death." °

The more ordinary method of execution was, however, to hang the victim by the neck, cut him down, and, while yet alive and conscious, tear out his heart and entrails, and fling them into a cauldron of boiling tar or water. As a special concession the condemned man sometimes begged that he "might not be bowelled ere he was dead."

On the gateways and bridges were gathered the Benin-like trophies of human heads, boiled and tarred, and weather-worn. In 1582 executions were so frequent that complaint was made that London was "but as one shambles for human flesh." On the strength of this four or five sufferers were sent into the country for execution.

The government of Elizabeth was a pure and simple despotism of a very degraded character:—

"If unpopularity met any man of rank or mark; if, in the hearing of a spy of Cecil's or of some long-eared and contemptible informer, he uttered a word or sentence which might be twisted and turned against him, or if the Queen found him less pliant or obsequious than she thought he ought to be he stood henceforth in the greatest danger of liberty, or life. Both those who adhered to the old religion, and those who were for proceeding further along the road of reform alike suffered." †

Notwithstanding the dangers surrounding would-be reformers, Bacon drew up (probably some time during 1589) "An Advertisement touching the controversies of

° See "The Church under Elizabeth" (Lee), Vol. II., p. 181.

† "Church under Queen Elizabeth," Vol. I., p. 282.

the Church of England." It was a bold attempt to throw oil upon troubled waters, and it is difficult to believe that its author was a brilliant young courtier aged only 28. Its measured sentences read like the composition of a man of 60. "It is more than time," says the youthful philosopher, "that there were an end and surseance made of this immodest and deformed manner of writing lately entertained.* . . . To turn religion into a comedy or satire; to search and rip up wounds with a laughing countenance; to intermix Scripture and scurrility sometimes in one sentence is a thing far from the devout reverence of a Christian, and scant be-seeming the honest regard of a sober man."

Bacon contrasts the "overweening and turbulent humours of these times," the "passionate and un-brotherly practices" of both parties with the lives of the Apostles and primitive Christians. "God grant that we may contend with other Churches as the vine with the olive, which of us beareth best fruit, and not as the briar with the thistle which of us is most unprofitable." He concludes: "These things have I in all sincerity and simplicity set down touching the controversies which now trouble the Church of England; and that without all art and insinuation, and therefore not like to be grateful to either part. Notwithstanding, I trust that what hath been said shall find a correspondence in their minds which are not contracted in partiality, and which love the whole better than a part. Whereby I am not out of hope that it may do good."

Singular words these from a young courtier to grave and painful divines! †

* The reference is probably to the scurrilous Martin Marprelate controversy.

† In this "Advertisement" (see Spedding, Vol. I.) Bacon uses the curious expression "*captious and strainable*." Shakespeare (*All's Well*, I. iii.) refers to a "*captious and intenable sieve*."

In later years he again intervened by a second tract, entitled, "Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England," wherein *inter alia* he attacks non-residence and pluralism.

In his old age we find him writing :—

"Remember, O Lord, how Thy servant hath walked before Thee ; remember what I have first sought and what hath been principal in my intentions. I have loved Thy assemblies. I have mourned for the divisions of Thy Church I have delighted in the brightness of Thy Sanctuary. . . . The state of the poor and oppressed have been precious in mine eyes. I have hated all cruelty and hardness of heart. I have, though in a despised weed, procured the good of all men."

The foregoing crudely sketched facts may possibly assist in arousing some slight conception of the state of religion and the human mind in "Shakespeare's" day.

"Do you suppose," says Bacon, "that when the entrances to the minds of men are obstructed with the darkest errors (and these deep seated, and, as it were, burnt-in) smooth, even spaces can be found in those minds so that the light of truth can be accurately reflected from them? A new process must be instituted by which we may *insinuate* ourselves into natures so disordered and closed up. For as the delusions of the insane are removed by art and ingenuity but aggravated by opposition and violence, so must we choose methods here that are adapted to the general insanity." *

Shakespeare's fame will eventually be measured by the profundity of the abyss from which he has raised, and is raising, the human mind.

HAROLD BAYLEY.

there any connection of ideas between "*strainable*" and "*intenable sieve*"?

* "*Temporis Partus Masculus.*"

THE MIGRATION OF WOODBLOCKS.

PROFESSOR GARDINER, writing in the "Dictionary of National Biography,"* observes that "in *The New Atlantis* there are two conspicuous points. On the one hand is the desire to benefit mankind by a science founded upon observation and experience: on the other hand is the tendency to under-estimate the difficulty of the task which leads to the belief that it can be entrusted to an official body organised for the purpose. If Bacon had been allowed to carry out his scheme it would probably have been found that officialism would have smothered scientific enquiry."

Other deterring considerations besides that of red tape will immediately occur to the reader. State officialism or in other words the overwhelming barbarism of the time, would assuredly have hanged, burned, or otherwisesilenced enquirers. Officialism placed Bacon's "*Advancement of Learning*" on the Italian *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.† It suppressed Sir W. Raleigh's "*History of the World*" for being "too saucy in censuring the acts of Kings." The illustrious Roger Bacon "soon learnt that to confront authority with experience or break away from the useless intricacies of scholastic metaphysics was an unpardonable offence, and his work was thwarted at every turn . . . his superiors managed to suppress his writings so effectually that nothing was printed till 1733."‡

There are books in public libraries to-day bearing the marks upon them of the bonfires that burnt their

* Vol. IV., Article "Bacon."

† Baconus (Franciscus) de Verulamio. De dignitate, and Augmentis Scientiarum. Donec corrigatur Decr. 3 Aprilis 1669. *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*. Romæ, Mdcccxli.

‡ "Social England." Traill. Vol. II., p. 102. (*Query date correct?*—ED.)

authors. In Spain, even until the year 1788, if not later, the despotism of the universities prohibited Newton and modern philosophy.* Nothing was permitted to supplant Aristotle and the superstitious fathers and doctors of the Church. For the slightest infraction, or supposed infraction, of political or religious propriety : authors, printers, and booksellers were everywhere maimed, imprisoned, or hung. It is recorded that—

“ Voltaire, among other schemes for benefitting France, wished to make known to his countrymen the wonderful discoveries of Newton, of which they were completely ignorant. With this view he drew up an account of the labours of that extraordinary thinker ; but here again the authorities interposed and forbade the work to be printed. Indeed the rulers of France, as if sensible that their only security was the ignorance of the people, obstinately set their face against every description of knowledge. Several eminent authors had undertaken to execute on a magnificent scale an Encyclopædia which should contain a summary of all the branches of science and of art. This, undoubtedly the most splendid enterprise ever started by a body of literary men, was at first discouraged by the government, and afterwards entirely prohibited.”†

It is sufficiently obvious that a frontal attack upon the citadel of European ignorance would have been not only futile, but suicidal. To have proclaimed the building of Solomon's Temple amid a flourish of publicity would have brought ruin upon architect and builders alike. No one imagines that Bacon would have been guilty of so puerile a folly ; yet, that behind the scenes of European literature deep movements were being hatched and great actions enacted is not open to doubt. In the preceding number of *BACONIANA* was quoted an extract from Glanvill's *Essays* (1676), in which we were told that Bacon actually “formed a society of experimenters in a romantick model, but could do no

* See Buckles “Hist. of Civilisation,” Vol. II., p. 418, Richards.

† Ibid, p. 188.

more. His time was not ripe for such performances." The "romantick model" is presumably *The New Atlantis*, hence, to those who study human history this unfinished little fable becomes invested with great importance. Into the mouth of the "Father of Solomon's House" Bacon puts, among other statements, the following :—

"We have consultations which of the inventions and experiences which we have discovered shall be published and which not, and take all an oath of secrecy for the concealing of those which we think fit to keep secret. . . . Lastly, we have circuits or visits of diverse principal cities of the Kingdom where, as it cometh to pass we do publish such new profitable inventions as we think good."

There are some curious facts in connection with printed books that seem to be explicable only by the theory that certain European literature was produced by a secret league who did their publishing on the circuit system. Many of the supposed printers' imprints upon title pages tend to support this idea. Figs. 1 and 2 are rather noteworthy examples. The eagle is obviously flying from town to town. It bears the motto *Movendo*—by moving, and further, Fig. 1 is surrounded by roses—the emblems of *secrecy*. Roberts in his *Printers' Marks** expresses his opinion that "shorn of all romance and glamour which seem inevitably to surround every early phase of typographic art a printer's device may be described as nothing more or less than a trademark," but that this is an erroneous deduction will be obvious to anyone who takes the trouble to acquaint himself with actual facts. The commercialism of mediæval publishers is very much open to question ; probably the truth is better expressed by the editor of *Harrison's Elizabethan England* † :—

* London, 1893. Intro. † *Scott Library*. London.

TANAQVILLI
FABRI
EPISTOLÆ.

PARS POSTERIOR.
EDITIO ALTERA PRIORI EMENDATIONE.

Addita sunt

ARISTOPHANIS
ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΖΟΥΣΑΙ

Cum Interpretatione nova, Notis & Emendationibus.



SALMÆRIL.

Typis & Impensis
ISAACI DESBORDES
&
IOANNIS LESNERII.

M. DC. LXXXIV.

M. FABII QUINTILIANI
INSTITUTIONUM
ORATORIARUM
LIBRI DUODECIM.

Summa diligentia ad fidem vetustissimorum
codicum recogniti ac restituti.

Accesserunt huic renovata editioni

DECLAMATIONES, quæ tam ex P. PITHONI,
J.C. Clarissimi, quam aliorum Bibliothecis
& editionibus colligi poterunt.

Cum TURNEBII, CAMERARIJ, PAREJ, GRONOVII,
& Aliorum Notis.

Cum Index locupletissimus, factus in Textum, quædam Notæ.



LUGD. BATAV. } Ex Officina HACKIANA.
ET
ROTTERODAMI.

clo b c l x v.



Fig. 3. Headline from *A History of the World* (Raleigh). London: 1665.



Fig. 4. Headline from *Ælii Antonii Dictionarium*, Madrid, 1683.

"It was a stirring age, and great human upheavals made sudden shiftings and scattering of kindred. . . . Harrison's own life just spans that stormy period which settled the destiny of the English race and left the race the masters of the earth. The part played in this mighty struggle by the printer boys of Aldersgate is something beyond all exaggeration. They made and unmade men and measures, and uprooted empires as well as recorded their history. Above all else these printers kept their own secrets ; for life and death were in every utterance."

To speak of the mediæval printers with tolerant superiority is, of course, foolish. They were mostly men of erudition,* they may indeed be said to have been the salt of their age, and they assuredly had every inducement to keep their own secrets.

Apart, however, from the subject of imprints there are other considerations which appear to point to a system of publishing on circuit under the direction of some superintending authority. As everyone knows, early books are often decorated with elaborate Head-and Tail-pieces. We find identically the same designs in books published thousands of miles apart. Fig. 3 is from "Raleigh's History of the World," London, 1665. Fig. 4 is from a Spanish dictionary published in Madrid in 1683. It will be observed with what infinite care every scrap of detail has been reproduced by the Spanish engraver. If the books of this period were mere ordinary commercial speculations, it is difficult to understand why the publishers went to the expense of adorning them so lavishly and needlessly with wood

* Established at Antwerp in 1555, he (Plantin) surrounded himself, as had the Estiennes and Alduses, with most of the learned and literary men of his time, among them Justus Lipsius, to whom Balzac attributed the Latin prefaces signed by Plantin. . . . His artistic probity caused him to submit the proofs of his works to strangers, with promise of recompense for faults indicated ; the Estiennes employed the same system.—"The Printed Book." Bouchot. London: 1887 ; p. 140.

engravings, and furthermore, why one publisher should slavishly copy the complicated designs of another !

We have, however, to deal with a fact even yet more curious than anything so far considered. The Bacon Society has in its possession a roughly classified collection of Head and Tail pieces, among which may be seen many examples of prints of *identical blocks*, employed by "rival" printers. Nowadays it is a simple matter by the aid of the electrotpe process to make manifold reproductions of any desired woodblock, but in olden times such methods were unknown, and the appearance of a facsimile print in Lisbon of an impression made 37 years previous in Paris, implies that the original block was transferred across the Pyrenees. By whom ? and why ? The difficulties and expenses of transport need no emphasis.

On every hand we find ourselves faced with similar problems. The Head piece used over the dedication of Wats' translation of the *Advancement of Learning*, produced at Oxford in 1640, was used six years previously by a London printer as the Head piece to Book IV. of *Moses and Aaron*. There is a blemish in the two prints conclusively proving them both to be impressions from the same block. How came it to be transferred from London to Oxford ? We have before us as we write, impressions from a block which was at Amsterdam in 1687, at Paris in 1697, and back again at the Hague in 1720. Similar instances of migration could be multiplied indefinitely. The 1720 edition of Pope's *Iliad*, "printed by W. Hunter for Bernard Lintott, contains a very curious design. In the previous year it was employed in Boerhaaves' *Method of Studying Physick*, "printed by H. P. for C. Rivington."

If we compare the three folio editions of Shakespeare's Plays, we are confronted at once with another instance of the same striking problem. The first folio

(1623) is "printed by Isaac Jaggard and Ed. Blount;" the second (1632) is "printed by Thos. Cotes for Robert Allot;" the third (1664) is "printed for P. C." Thomas Cotes, the printer of folio No. 2, uses at least 8 blocks (including an initial letter) that were employed 9 years previously by Jaggard. The printer of folio No. 3 uses at least 3 blocks that were employed by Thos. Cotes 32 years earlier. A writer in *The Library*, discussing an edition of a certain disputed work, observed recently, "But supposing for the sake of argument that some printer had wished to reprint the work, should we expect to find him in possession of exactly similar type to that used 20 or 30 years previously and of exactly the same initial letters, head and tail pieces and ornaments as those used by Wolfe in 1559? I think this highly improbable."*

It is of course quite wildly improbable; yet apparently it is a very frequent fact, and a solution must, sooner or later, be forthcoming.

[The above article has been submitted to Mr. Charles T. Jacobi, of the Chiswick Press, London. Mr. Jacobi is the author of "Books and Printing," London (1902), and several other works on typography. He writes as follows:—

"It is a well-known fact to Bibliographers that the same blocks were sometimes used by different printers in two places, quite far apart, and at various intervals during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. That the same blocks were employed is apparent from a comparison of technical defects of impressions taken at different places, and at two periods. There was no method of duplication in existence until Stereotyping was first invented in 1725; even then the details were somewhat crude, and the process being new, it met with much opposition and was practically not adopted until the early part of the nineteenth century. *Electrotyping*, which is the ideal method of reproducing wood blocks, was not introduced until 1836 or thereabouts. Of course it was quite possible to re-engrave the

* *The Library*. No. 9.

same design, but absolute fidelity could not be relied on by those means, even if executed by the same hand.

"These remarks are not intended to convey any opinion for or against the theories advanced in the article you have submitted. —C. T. JACOBI."]

SYMBOLIC BOOK ORNAMENTS.*

THE BEAR DESIGN.

THE Bear is strangely and peculiarly introduced in many of our Hieroglyphic Pictures.† Usually he is sitting up on his haunches. This bear cannot be interpreted as an allusion to the crest of the Nevilles, for though ragged, he is without his rugged staff and chain. We suggest that here is a parable of the method by which Bacon perfected his works and taught others how to achieve perfection. In the *Sylva Sylvarum* (or *Nat. Hist.*) he notes that *Bears lick their whelps to bring them into shape*. Dr. Rawley in his brief "Life of Bacon" says that his master did with his works as *Bears do with their young*, licking them over many times, to bring them into shape. In a play of much earlier date than the "Life," *Shakespeare* shows a similar acquaintance with the then unpublished scientific note.

"Deformity doth mock my body,
To disproportion me in every part,

* Preceding articles on this subject have appeared as follows :—

THE PAN TAIL-PIECE. BACONIANA, No. 6, Vol. II.

THE NEW BIRTH. BACONIANA, No. 7, Vol. II.

FLOWERS AND FRUITS. BACONIANA, No. 8, Vol. II.

See also BACONIANA, No. 18, Vol. V.; No. 24, Vol. VI.; No 25, Vol. VI.; No 36, Vol. IX.; and Nos. 1 and 2. Vol. I., New Series, 1903.

† See Figs. 3 and 4.

Like to a chaos, or an unlick'd bearwhelp
That carries no impression like the dam."

—3 *Hen. VI. iii. 2.*

A dateless metrical version in English of Launay's *Histoire Tragique de Romeo et Juliet* has in the *Introductions to the Reader* a few lines about the Bear :—

"Amid the desert rockes, the mountaine beare,
Bringes forth *unform'd, unlike her selfe, her yong* :
Nought els but lumpes of fleshe withouten heare,
In tract of time, her often lycking tong
Geues them such shape, as doth (ere long) delight
The lookers on. . . . Right so my Muse
Hath now (at length) with trauell long brought forth
Her tender whelpes, her diuers kindes of style,
Such as they are, of nought, or little woorth
Which carefull trauell and a longer whyle
May better shape."

Here is the perfect idea of the parable penned in the *Sylva Sylvarum*, and mentioned by Rawley in his description of Francis Bacon's method of perfecting his works. Here, too, is the full interpretation of the "Bear design" in the head-lines and tail-pieces.

It must not be supposed that Dogs in Emblem pictures represent anything malevolent, truculent, or worrying. Emblems were adornments of Bacon's beautiful Palace of Truth and Divine Wisdom.

"There's nothing ill can dwell in such a temple.
If the ill-spirit have so fair a house,
Good things will strive to dwell in't."

We therefore look for another explanation of the Dogs to be seen in old books, remembering that amongst the pre-Baconian water marks we noticed many Dogs, chiefly Talbots, such as are found (apparently with a similar signification) in the prints. Dogs were, in the symbolism of India, types of the Messengers of Truth,

and Hunting Dogs figured as *Seekers after Truth*. A Dog with a book before him is the Egyptian hieroglyph for Learning, Science, Wisdom. Diana (the Holy Spirit) is represented as accompanied by a Dog ; she is a huntress, and in the Greek legends Æsculapius, the great Healer of souls, is figured by a Dog, his name being a compound of "AISH CALEB" (the Dog of Isis)—again the Holy Spirit.

It appears, then, that *Bacon* had these things in his mind when he spoke of "the hunting and hounding of Nature," and that thus the Dog, whether in the woodcuts or in the occult language of the Rose Cross brethren, became a symbol of *Reason, Hunting, Research, Experiment, &c.* Plutarch (of whom *Bacon* was a great admirer), when speaking of the Egyptian myths, has this passage :—

"Can it be imagined that it is the Dog himself that is thus revered under the name of Hermes (*Mercury*)? They are the qualities of the animal, his constant vigilance, and his acumen in distinguishing friends from foes, which have rendered him, as Plato expresses it, a fit emblem of that God who is the more immediate patron of Reason."

There are but few metaphors in *Bacon*, drawn directly from the Dog, so we observe with the more interest that these few are all concerned with the *Hunt of Pan*, or the hunting out of a true natural philosophy by the aid of Reason.

Thus, in comparing straightforward speech with sophistry, he says that "the one is as the greyhound which has his advantage in the race, and the other as the hare that has her advantage in the turn.* In the *Anatomy of Melancholy*, when arguing that Poverty and Learning usually go hand in hand, the author says : "It is held by

* *Advt. L. ii. 1.*

some that to keep them poor will make them study. . . . *A fat dog cannot hunt.*" It may, however, be suggested that the hunting Dog is kept lean by his exertions. In the head-lines, besides Dogs with noses to the ground, on the scent, and hunting, are others with heads erect and tongues stretched out as if to taste or lap. Sometimes these tongues reach towards winged or fawn-like creatures, which we take to be the "elementary" or "vital" spirits of Nature; sometimes such Dogs remind us of those "who, being thirsty" for knowledge, "lap hastily of the waters of the River Nilus (Wisdom), only to serve their necessity as they run along the shore;" or, as *Bacon* would say, "as they sail round the coasts of all Provinces of Knowledge."

Other kinds of Dogs (*not* hunting) are, as we all know, catalogued by *Shakespeare* † for the sake of distinguishing "everyone, according to the gift which bounteous Nature hath in him closed, whereby he does receive particular addition from the bill that writes them all alike—and so of men." In those last words lies the pith of the matter to our Poet. We are now able to see why, although Francis Bacon loved his Dog, his "familiar" and most sympathetic four-legged companion, yet little is said in books which we chiefly associate with that name of the Dog as a domestic animal. It was not thus that the Dog was to be considered on the pages of the emblem writers. In the metaphors, similes, and figurative allusions he is to be classed with beasts of prey, and chiefly in view of his "affinities" to two-legged creatures of similar dispositions. In the Parabolic Pictures or Hieroglyphic Designs we are to think of him as *the Hunting Dog*, a symbol of patient, persistent, Experimental Philosophy—"smelling out" a trail, following it up and seizing it; or, in other

* *Macb.* iii. 1.

words, as an Emblem of the Pursuit of Knowledge, and of Reasoning upon Experience.



Facsimile of Headpiece from Pope's Translation of
The Iliad. London. 1720.

NEW LIGHT ON *TWELFTH NIGHT*.

AMONG the Harleian MSS. is a Diary by Manningham, a student of the Middle Temple, in Elizabeth's reign. He tells how the Play of *Twelfth Night* was performed in the great Hall of his Inn of Court. It is a matter of surprise that, interested as he seems to be in the Play, he does not mention the author. It is true, he casually remarks that Shakespeare was present, but he does not connect him by any word with the author of the Play. He gives a short *précis* of it in these words:—

"At our feast, Feb. 2, 1601—2, we had a Play called *Twelve Night*, or *What You Will*, much like the *Comedy of Error*, or *Menechmi* in Plautus, but most like and neere to that in Italian called *Inganni*. A good practise to make the steward believe his lady widowe in love with him, by counterfayting a letter, as from his lady in general terms, telling him what she liked best in him, and then when he came to practise, making him believe they took him to be mad."

Tradition says that the characters of the Play were drawn from life, and that they were well-known persons at court.

Seeing what a world of criticism the Plays have evoked since their first appearance in print, it is a matter of marvel that until now the true originals of the Lady Olivia and the Steward have escaped detection. According to scholars, the Spanish predecessor of Olivia in *Los Engannos* was the Lady Clavella. But I have no doubt whatever that the original of Olivia the Countess, was Arabella the Countess, that mysterious, deeply fascinating character of history, the ill-fated daughter of Darnley's brother Charles Stuart and Elizabeth Cavendish, who was daughter to the Countess of Shrewsbury, better known as Bess of Hardwicke.

Charles Stuart died when Arabella was barely two years old, and Mary Queen of Scots, who apparently took a considerable interest in her, added a clause to her will, giving: "To my niece Arabella the earldom of Lennox held by her Father."

And he "for whose dear love they say, she hath abjured the sight and company of men,"* is he forthcoming in the story of Arabella's life? Surely, he was no less a personage than Robert Essex, whose execution plunged her into the most profound melancholy for a year after.

In 1601 she writes to Sir Henry Brounker:—

"I have lost all I can lose or almost care to lose, now I am constrained to renew those melancholy thoughts by the smarting feelings of my great loss: who may well say I never shall have the like friend."

The anniversary of his death she spends shut up alone in her chamber, sending Sir Henry the "ill-favoured picture of her grief."†

* "Like a cloistress she will veiled walk, and water once a day her chamber round with eye-offending brine: all this to season a brother's dead love, which she would keep fresh and lasting, in her sad remembrance."—*Twelfth Night*, Act I., Scene 2.

† "Life of Arabella Stuart," by E. T. Bradley, Vol. I., p. 146.

The Captain tells Viola in the Play that the Countess Olivia will "admit no kind of suit, no, not the Duke's," and in a private letter we have Sir William Fowler's statement that the Lady Arabella "will not hear of marriage."

In lieu of the one Duke Orsino, we have many Dukes who sue for Arabella's hand in vain. Duke Ulrich, the Dane, the Queen's brother, Duke of Holstein; Count Maurice of Nassau, who "pretendeth to be Duke of Gueldres;" and last but not least, Duke Esme Stuart, of Lennox, the Lord D'Aubigny, the favourite and relation of James, who before his own marriage was so desirous that he should wed Arabella. We hear of Esme that he "longeth after her," and this places him unquestionably in the position of the love-lorn Duke of Illyria. What the devotion of Esme failed to win, the green love of a boy accomplished. The Duke to whom she alludes in a letter as "the Duke" was rejected, and William Seymour, the younger son of Lord Beauchamp and grandson of the Earl of Hertford, was loved passionately and married. As with Olivia so with Arabella. Her biographer gives us her impressions of this love story much in the same words as she might comment on the loves of Olivia and Sebastian: "It is only too likely that Arabella's infatuation for the handsome boy overpowered her reason, and that in spite of all opposition she insisted on the marriage."

This occurred eight years after the Play was produced at Shrovetide, in the Middle Temple. But as the wooing of the Lady and the boy had been ten years in progress, the author of *Twelfth Night* may well have taken Seymour for his Hero Sebastian, and have guessed to what Arabella's hot-headed whims would lead her. The Play discloses a very close acquaintance in the author with the *on dits* and inner intrigues of Court life, and that is very suggestive and interesting for us..

And now to discover in the whimsical person of Malvolio the "ridiculous" and "fantastical" Sir William Fowler, who was Queen Anne of Denmark's secretary, and had become, as E. T. Bradley tells us, "intimate with Arabella's relations through his father." Sir Thomas Fowler was the steward and faithful friend and adviser of her grandmother Margaret, the dowager Countess of Lennox.

"William Fowler was a ridiculous personage, at once simpleton and buffoon ; but extravagant as is his language, there is a ring of sincerity about his praises of the lady (Arabella), which has led to the supposition that Fowler would, if he had dared, have joined the ranks of her suitors." He calls her the eighth wonder of the world, and writes two Sonnets "unto my most virtuous and honourable lady." A poem is given to prove the extravagant admiration evinced by Fowler for the Lady Arabella. In I. D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, he describes this "rhyming and Fantastical Secretary" as "one of the butterflies who quiver on the fair flowers of a Court," and he quotes from letters of his concerning the Princess, the words, "I dare not attempt her" which lend themselves to the interpretation that he aspired where he could not hope to win. Not one thing only indicates Arabella and Fowler as the originals of Olivia and Malvolio, but point after point. The Play itself, as I hope to show in another Paper, is far older than Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night*.

In conclusion, there is a signature to be found in an Autograph Book belonging to Arabella Stuart, which is interesting as evincing a certain friendship between her and the writer. The name stands thus, *Francis Bacon*. The Book was left her by Mary, Queen of Scots, and the signature was added after it came into her possession.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

WHEN DID FRANCIS ST. ALBAN DIE? WHERE WAS HE BURIED?

WHEN, as individuals or as a Society, we enter upon any serious study or research it is desirable that we should make sure our foundations—that we should be absolutely clear as to what we are talking, arguing, and inquiring about, and as to the ultimate result and benefit of these inquiries.

This may appear a trite and common-place remark, and so with regard to most literary students it would be. With Baconians the case is different, because, since the beginning of methodised researches more than forty years ago, these very inquisitions and explorations have led those engaged in them into entirely new regions, and into heights and depths of speculation quite beyond the original scope of our design. And what was that original design or aim? It was doubtless the same which is being followed at the present day by at least ninety per cent. of even earnest Baconians, until by reading and examination they have advanced farther towards the heart of the mystery. This one predominating and ever-absorbing question we all know well; it is this—“*Did Francis Bacon Write Shakespeare?*” To hear the discussions of many literary people one might suppose that in this question the whole of Baconism lies as in a nutshell, and that this problem once settled there would be nothing left to “*wrangle*” about. That the man Shaksper, Shakpurre, or Shaxberd, was not “*Shakespeare*” (a witty, allusive and punning name for the great Poet-philosopher), and that every line of the works called “*Shakespeare*” was penned by the “concealed poet,” Francis “*Bacon*,” is as absolutely proved as it is possible to prove anything by any hitherto accepted method of analysis,

whether of words or matter. But we must not be allured from the main subject to its various important and fascinating side-paths. The question set down is not *the Thing*, but a branch of it; for is it not true that at the present moment the proper study of Baconians is "*Bacon*," Who was he? Where was he born? How and where did he live? What were his aims? What did he achieve? With many more such simple but unanswered questions.

Let us pass all these, and to-day enter upon a brief inquiry as to *When and where did Francis St. Alban die?* It will probably be thought that this is indeed "a bootless inquisition," for is it not known to every reader of Bacon's "Life" that he died on Easter Sunday, April 9th, 1626? Dr. William Rawley, his Chaplain and Secretary, gave this information in the "Life," first published in 1657, and several times re-printed, with slight or considerable variations, to which we may by-and-by return. In passing, it is well to remark that this "Life" by Rawley goes for very little as an historical document. It seems, on the contrary, to be an example of the ingenious method by which Bacon instructed his followers, on occasion, "*to conceal as well as to reveal*." The opening statement shows this:—"Francis Bacon, the glory of his age and nation, the adorning and ornament of learning, was born in *York House or York Place*, in the Strand," &c. The biographer wishes the general public to suppose *York House* and *York Place* to be one and the same. But *York House* was the residence of Sir Nicholas Bacon, and was in the Strand; whereas *York Place* was the old name for the *Palace* of Whitehall.* Any observant reader must be struck by the scantiness of the particulars given by Rawley concerning the death and burial

* There are several other most questionable points in this "Life" upon which so much has been made to hang.

of his beloved master. There is no mention of any person who was with him when he died ; no one recorded his last words ; no one is said to have attended his funeral ; no clergyman is mentioned as having read the service, or delivered the customary funeral sermon. And yet, despite the meagreness of these records, the few particulars which are handed down to us differ so much as to persuade us that not one of them is true.

Men like Dr. Sprat and Dr. Wallis (Presidents of the Royal Society), and Dr. Thomas Fuller, Sir Julius Cæsar, the Bacons' cousin, cannot have been unacquainted with the circumstances of Bacon's death, or with the account of it written by his chaplain, Dr. Rawley. Why, then, do these others ignore Rawley, saying, one that Bacon died at the house of his friend and physician, Dr. Parry, in London ; another that he died at the house of Dr. Witherbourne, a mile and a-half from Highgate ; a third, that he died at the house of "his cousin, Sir Julius Cæsar." Whereas Rawley states that he died "at the Earl of Arundel's place in Highgate, near London, to which place he casually repaired about a week before." The form of illness will also be found differently given by the various witnesses. Surely these were "all honourable men"—honest one would suppose, and not likely to speak of things which they did not understand. Why, then, did they all deliberately contrive that their witness should not agree together ? That is one question ; and since Rawley also states calmly and simply that "he * was buried in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans," no pains have been spared in the attempt to discover if this were true.

With all the inquiries made on the spot, and with the correspondence which ensued, it is

* The Name is never again mentioned after the opening words of this "Life."

unnecessary to trouble present readers; it is sufficient to say that in the end I received *a most positive assurance* from the late Earl of Verulam, at Gorhambury, that Francis St. Alban was *not*, as had been supposed, buried in the vaults of the Church of St. Michael's. Those vaults were thoroughly examined by himself and a party of experts, and every coffin was seen and identified before the final bricking up of these crypts, by order of the Board of Works. "*Bacon was certainly not buried there.*"

In the *Sylva Sylvarum* several notes occur concerning the preservation of documents, structures, and human bodies from the ravages of time. Bacon speaks of Numa and his two coffins of lead, one for his embalmed body, the other for his works; and although it is evident from the whole passage that it is ambiguous, and intended to be a parable of the preservation of Bacon's own writings, still when Mr. Donnelly was here, in 1888, we thought it worth while to examine into the possibility of Bacon having imitated Numa, by causing himself, and the keys to his writings and method, to be enclosed in the base of the monument in St. Michael's; for it must strike any lover of art that no sculptor or architect would have designed so disproportionately high a base for that fine statue unless some purpose were to be served *by the base itself*. Moreover, there is a crack across the black marble plaque which bears a portion of the inscription, as though violence had been used in attempting to force it out. The old caretaker of the Church told me that when he was a boy, sixty years before, he and his father had entered the Church early one morning and found, to their amazement and distress, that an effort had been made to remove the statue. It was pulled crooked on its base, and the right hand and projecting part of the right foot were broken off. This the old man supposed to be the work

of "body snatchers," or of "some folks who went to get skulls out of graves."

However, on measuring the monument it seemed evident that no human creature taller than a child or a dwarf could have been enshrined within that supposed tomb, and we could only speculate and ponder upon the possibility that this "burial place" might be known to initiates as a repository for some of Bacon's precious documents written like Numa's "in parchment, and covered over with watch-candles of wax, three or four fold."

Future inquirers will do well to observe that there is in the inscription on the monument at St. Michael's Church nothing which expresses that Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viscount of St. Alban, was buried in that place. It is not even stated that he was dead, but—"Light of the Sciences, Law of Eloquence, *thus he sat.*" For the date, it does not appear that it was *the date of his death*, but in 1626 when he was 66 years of age, his *connection* (his composed or organised body of friends and assistants) was *dissolved*. Like Prospero perhaps he dismissed his ministering spirits to the elements—"Be free," he said to each, "and fare thou well." He had made all smooth for them, and they could now shift for themselves. In future, as Prospero hints in his epilogue, he will work *by his own strength which is his own*, but helped by the "good hands, and gentle breath" of such as care to stay with him in his loneliness.

But to return from fancies to facts, in February 1900, a very learned German gentleman with whom I had for twelve years been in somewhat close correspondence wrote to this effect: "On such a date four years ago I received a letter from you in which you stated a belief that there was but one great author in the century between 1570—1670, and that Bacon did not die in 1626,

he only died to the world, but that he lived to a great age. May I ask if you are still of those opinions, and your reasons for them?" Although assured that my correspondent was well aware of these reasons of belief, I wrote them out at full length, repeating my conviction that Francis St. Alban *died only to the world in 1626*. As to later dates I stated a strong suspicion that he was alive, and busy revising and writing new and voluminous works on many subjects in 1640—1. It would be very satisfactory, and would explain every difficulty if it could be proved that he was doing the same in 1662; but perhaps the books then issued were of earlier date or published (like so many of the "minor Poets and Dramatists") *traditionally*.

In answer to this came an enthusiastic letter—triumphant, because "not an American, not a German, but a true Englishwoman" had discovered this "the capital secret" of Rosicrucianism. The writer then stated as an absolute matter of fact that Francis St. Alban lived to the age of 106—(*that is the age assigned to the Rosicrucian Father*). He died in 1668 in full possession of his faculties, having for forty years after his supposed death continued to produce a mass of literature of which hereafter we may have occasion to speak.

Meanwhile I was also informed that "Our Francis" retired into the life of a hermit or recluse, and assumed the name of "Father X." My kind friend also sent me a small portrait of Our Francis as he appeared in his plain black gown without collar or ruff, and with hair and beard cut short. Still there is the "front of Jove himself" the delicately formed nose and mouth, the fine facial outline, and the upstanding curl on the forehead. The engraving is modern, and carefully clipped to prevent identification. From what was it taken? Where is the original? The artist and publisher were

clearly of the *secret Society*, since as usual with such portraits, the eyes are ingeniously made to look out at different angles, and to be of different sizes, yet not so as seriously to injure the drawing.

Shortly after this communication, and the gift of the picture, my learned and inspiring patron wrote brief regrets that he was no longer able to continue our correspondence. A few corroborative particulars have since that date (1900), been gleaned with regard to the death of Francis St. Alban. Will not some amongst our growing Society take up these loose threads and spin upon them?

1. Who was the Philosopher with whom Thomas Bushel went to the Isle of Man, and there lived in a cave? The bibliography of the Isle of Man should be consulted, and every attainable book closely examined.

2. The history of St. Francis Xavier, said to be so thoroughly well known, now has doubts cast upon its authenticity. All that has been attributed to St. Francis is said to be full of interpolations and unauthentic particulars. Is it possible that Father X travelled to India, or that through agents he established the great Freemason influence amongst the natives which is now found to exist there?

3. My attention has been drawn to a charming little compilation from the writings of Francis Bacon, entitled, "Thoughts that Breathe, and Words that Burn." It is edited by Dr. Alexander B. Grosart, and opens with a glowing Introduction in praise of "this supreme thinker and writer," "an artist of cunningest faculty," ever uplifting his readers, "Immortal."

On page 16 of this little book is a piece headed "Bacon in Retirement, 1629." It is an Epistle Dedicatory to Bishop Andrews in the Volume of "*Holy Wars*," and the date is there 1629; three years later than the writer is supposed to have died. It will be

easy for opponents to say that the date 1629 applies to the date of *publication*; for the "Advertisement touching an Holy War" was published in that year. But first, the date is added to "Bacon in Retirement, 1629," next, no other piece in the book has the date of publication; and lastly, the title-page of the book itself states that it was "written in 1622," "whereunto the author prefixed an epistle to the Bishop of Winchester *last deceased*." Now Andrews, Bishop of Winchester died in 1626, so he could not be "last deceased" to Francis St. Alban if the latter also died early in that year. It will be desirable in future to observe the dates on books, and to note any case where it appears to be the time of *writing*, and not of *printing*, which is truly recorded.

4. The latest piece of intelligence received is the following:—The Head of a large school for ladies "spent her Christmas holidays at Berlin. One evening her host supped out. On his return he told of how 'an old Professor (?) whom he had met—and *who must be cracky*, said that Bacon had not died in 1626, but lived on in Germany; married, and had children. Many of his descendants are alive there to this day.'"

Let it be enquired how much of this is true. The "Children" we may conceive to be the many "*Heirs of his Invention*," which Our Francis produced in retirement, of which he said that they were the true progeny of childless men. But with regard to a residence in Germany, may not that also be true? The dragging-in to *Hamlet* of the name of the Rosicrucian centre, Wittenberg, and of the two Rosicrucian names Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, the "Golden Star" of Truth, are suspicious incidents. We see how little as yet we know, but it is a step forward when we discover that there is something worth knowing, and a step farther when we become convinced that we know nothing.

CONSTANCE M. POTT.

THE COMEDY OF ERRORS.

THE *Comedy of Errors* is the first of the Shakespeare plays of which we have any notice. Its history is interesting as affording one of the few glimpses we possess of the real life of William Shakspeare. It is instructive as illustrating the early date of the plays, an important branch of the inquiry into their authorship.

For William Shakspeare, who was born in 1564, came to London from Stratford not earlier than 1585, in which year his twin children were born, and more probably not before the last quarter of 1587; since in September, 1587, he concurred with his father and mother, John and Mary Shakspeare, in mortgaging his mother's farm of Ashbies to John Lambert. Moreover, in 1587, John Shakspeare's fortunes reached their lowest ebb, and he was imprisoned for debt; in the same year several theatrical companies visited Stratford; and all circumstances point to the probability that William Shakspeare, no longer gaining aid from his father's trade, followed one of these companies to London and commenced his theatrical career about the end of 1587. If any of the Shakespeare plays were in fact produced before that date, William Shakspeare cannot have been their author.

A *Historie of Errors* was acted before Queen Elizabeth at Hampton Court by "the children of Paul's" in 1576—eleven years, therefore, before William Shakspeare left Stratford. This was apparently the first form of the *Comedy of Errors*. The play is adapted from the *Menæchmi* of Plautus, no translation of which was published until 1595. The writer must therefore have been a classical scholar, and had some interest at Court to get his play acted before the Queen.

The play must have pleased the Queen, since it was

taken up by the Lord Chamberlain's Company ; and we learn from the Account of Revels that "*A Historie of Ferrars* (doubtless the same play misspelt) was shewed before Her Majesty at Wyndesor on Twelf daie (1581) at night, enacted by the Lord Chamberlayne's servants." The play remained with the same company until the time of James I., and was acted by them before the King in 1604.

Was William Shakspeare or Francis Bacon the author of this play ?

In 1576 William Shakspeare was a boy of 12 at Stratford School.

Francis Bacon, in this very year, came for the first time to attend Elizabeth's Court for a few months, before the Queen sent him to Paris in the train of her Ambassador, Sir Amyas Paulet. He had left Cambridge the previous Christmas, after nearly three years' residence, overflowing with classical and other learning, already a favourite of the Queen, and eager to increase her favour.

Brilliant and accomplished, devoted to the drama as he afterwards proved himself, what wonder if Francis Bacon should contrive such an entertainment for the Queen, and with his Court interest readily obtain the services of the "children of Paul's" and a representation at Hampton Court.

In February, 1587, a masque of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, partly, if not wholly devised by Francis Bacon, was presented to Her Majesty by the Gentlemen of Gray's Inn, which was Bacon's Inn, where he was chief director of the revels; and in 1592 and 1594 he wrote two masques, *The Conference of Pleasure* and *The Indian Prince*, for Essex to present before the Queen. It is certain, therefore, that Francis Bacon did repeatedly provide entertainment for the Queen's dramatic taste.

The coincidence of the date of the production of this play with Francis Bacon's first appearance at Court, his classical qualifications, his dramatic skill, and his courtier aspirations, all point to Francis Bacon as a possible and even the probable author of this play; nor can any other known author of this date be easily suggested. Lilly, the earliest Elizabethan dramatist of note, began writing, it appears, in 1578; he never claimed this play, nor is it in his style. William Shakspeare, at this date at least, had no part in it.

The next notice we have of the *Comedy of Errors* is very remarkable and suggestive. *A Comedy of Errors like to Plautus his Menæchmi* was played at Gray's Inn on 29th December, 1594. The play was acted after a long masque, of which Spedding assures us Bacon was in whole or in part the composer. The proceedings are recorded in the *Gesta Graiorum*,* from which Halliwell-Phillipps extracts a full account.

The play then acted belonged, as we have seen, to the Lord Chamberlain's Company. and was doubtless substantially the same as that acted in 1579 and 1581; but signs of revision have been pointed out. In the play, as printed for the first time in the Folio of 1623, allusion is made to the civil war in France—France being described as “making war against her heir” (Act III., Sc. 2, l. 125). This war lasted from 1589 to 1594, and the reference to it must have been added after 1581, and about or shortly before 1594. The allusion tends to identify the play printed in the Folio with that acted in 1594.

The Lord Chamberlain's actors were Burbage and his company, including William Shakspeare himself. This company had been acting two comedies or interludes before the Queen at Greenwich, on the 26th and

* “Outlines,” Vol. I., pp. 122—4.

28th December, which is the first record of William Shakspeare having acted before the Queen.

Halliwell-Phillipps* says:—

"In accordance with the then usual custom of the Inns of Court, professional actors were engaged for the representation of the *Comedy of Errors*, and, although their names are not mentioned, it may be safely inferred that the play was acted by the Lord Chamberlain's Company, that to which Shakspeare was then attached, and the owners of the copyright."

Mr. Sidney Lee† indeed says:—

"Shakespeare was acting on the same day before the Queen at Greenwich, and it is doubtful if he were present."

Judge Webb,‡ however, points out that the play was not acted until the second day of the revels—the 29th December.

If, therefore, we may assume that the play was acted at Gray's Inn by the Lord Chamberlain's Company, and that William Shakspeare was himself present as one of the actors, we have here a glimpse of the real life of William Shakspeare. We naturally enquire whether he was then and there recognised as the author of this play, afterwards attributed to him, and as the author of the four or five other Shakespeare plays which had already been produced.

So far from any such recognition being recorded, we are told that on the following evening the prime mover of the revels was arraigned, for having "foisted a company of base and common fellows to make up our disorders with a play of errors and confusions."

Of this "company of base and common fellows" William Shakspeare was an undistinguished member. It seems impossible, therefore, to suppose he could have

* "Outlines," Vol. I., p. 124.

† "Life of William Shakespeare," p. 70.

‡ "The Mystery of William Shakespeare," p. 49.

been known to be the author of the play. Yet Bacon, who controlled the revels, must have known who was in fact the author, and, if he was himself that author, may well have kept silence.

But, further, it must be noted and considered that in this same year, and the preceding year, 1593, were published the much-admired poems of *Venus and Adonis* and *Lucrece*, each dedicated to the Earl of Southampton in the name of William Shakespeare, a name not uncommon, but never before spelt in this fashion. Moreover, we are invited by Mr. Sidney Lee to observe how “the terms of devoted friendship” used in the second dedication, “suggest that Shakespeare’s relations with the brilliant young nobleman had grown closer since he dedicated *Venus and Adonis* to him in colder language a year before.”

Southampton was a member of Gray’s Inn; he must have been present at the play. Can the despised actor, this “base and common fellow,” have been Southampton’s devoted friend?

Nay more, according to Mr. Sidney Lee,* “Of the 154 (Shakespeare) Sonnets that survive outside his plays, the greater number were in all likelihood composed between the spring of 1593 and the autumn of 1594.” These, he argues, were addressed to Southampton, and the ascription is probable. The first seventeen Sonnets urge Southampton to marry. Already Lord Burleigh’s grand-daughter, Lady Elizabeth Vere, had been offered to him in marriage, but he was reluctant. Later Sonnets touch on even more delicate matters, rivalry in the affections of some lady of the Court. Can it be reasonably believed that one of these “base and common fellows” was Southampton’s intimate monitor, and his rival in the favours of the Court lady.

9 Surely the recorded facts attending this performance

(* Page 85).

of the *Comedy of Errors* in 1594 are irreconcilable with the claim of William Shakspeare to be the author of the Play, of the Poems, or of the Sonnets.

Nor does William Shakspeare, the actor, appear to have thereafter emerged from this neglect and disesteem, nor is there any ground for supposing that he did claim the authorship of this play, which, though often acted, was first printed in the Folio of 1623. Even had he revised it, of which there is no evidence, how could he call it his own, and ignore the classical scholar who adapted it from the Latin ! and would that scholar have made no protest ?

But this, according to the current Shakespeare theory, was William Shakspeare's normal standard of literary morality.

In 1579, the very year Francis Bacon returned from Paris (and let the coincidence of date be noted), the second Shakespeare play appeared, namely, "The Jew shewne at the Bull, representing the greedinesse of worldly choosers, and bloody mindes of usurers." This was the earliest form of *The Merchant of Venice*, taken from two Italian novels, one at least not then translated. The author, therefore, was an Italian scholar. Yet this play, we are assured, was appropriated by William Shakspeare, who called it his own ; and the Italian scholar made no sign !

In 1584, while William Shakspeare was still at Stratford, the *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, then called *Felix and Philomena*, was acted before the Queen. This play was taken from the Spanish, by a Spanish scholar, enjoying Court favour, and this play also, we are assured, was appropriated by William Shakspeare, and the Spanish scholar never murmured !

And sometime before 1589, before or about the time when William Shakspeare left Stratford, *Hamlet* was produced, taken from the Latin or from the French, by

some scholar who was also a philosopher. This play gained immense popularity; yet this also William Shakspeare appropriated, called it his own, and built upon it his highest fame. But the philosopher made no objection!

Is this story even plausible? Were not the Latin, Italian, Spanish and French scholars, and the philosopher one and the same, having good reason for remaining anonymous, and was not that one Francis Bacon?

How, then, came these and the other plays to be attributed to William Shakspeare?

In 1594, and until 1598 the plays were produced and published anonymously; a strong fact against the Shakspeare authorship, for why should he hide his light? But from 1595 we find the plays began to be attributed to the same author as the poems.

John Weever, in 1599, addressed an epigram to “honey-tongued Shakespeare” praising the poems as “an unmatched achievement,” and mentioning as his work “*Romeo and Richard*, and more whose names I know not.”

In 1598 *Love's Labour's Lost* was published, with the name of “W. Shakspeare” on the title-page; and in the same year Meres praises “mellifluous and honey-tongued Shakespeare” for his poems and “his sugared Sonnets” among his private friends; and also as the most excellent in both tragedy and comedy for the stage, enumerating six tragedies and six comedies, including *Gentlemen of Verona*, *Errors*, and *Merchant of Venice*, which, however assigned to Shakspeare, he cannot have originally written.

Dr. Ingleby, who collected the contemporary allusions to Shakespeare in his *Centurie of Praise*, points out that none, before the publication of the Folio of 1623, directly identify the man or the actor with the writer of

the plays and poems; and it is not a little remarkable to find that the actor, notwithstanding the praise bestowed on the plays, seems to have remained unnoticed.

In 1599 Burbage, the head of the company to which Shakspeare belonged, and who therefore knew him well, built the Globe Theatre, and "to ourselves we joined those deserving men Shakspeare, Hemings, Condall, Phillips, and others;" and when he occupied the Blackfriars Theatre in 1609, he placed in it "men players, which were Heming, Condall, Shakspeare, &c." No distinction is made between Shakspeare and his fellow-actors.

In 1601 Shakspeare acted with his company before the Queen, the night before Essex's execution, without apparent suspicion that he was in any way concerned with the play of *Richard II.*, although the acting of that play, on the eve of Essex's insurrection, was one of the acts of treason alleged against that noble's accomplices.

At James's Coronation, in 1603, Shakspeare, who with Burbage and others were now licensed as the King's Company, walked undistinguished with the other actors in the procession; and all alike received four and a-half yards of scarlet cloth, the badge of their profession.

And in January, 1604-5, the summoning of Burbage's Company to play before James's Queen at Southampton's house is thus described by Sir Walter Cope, in a letter to Viscount Cranborne "at the Court":—

"I have sent and bene all thys morning huntyng for *players, juglers and such kinde of creaturs*, but fynde them hard to fynde; wherefore leaving notes for them to seeke me. Burbage ys come, and sayes ther ys no newe playe that the Queene hath not seene, but they have revived an olde one cawled *Love's Labore Lost*, which for wytt and myrthe, he says, will please her exceedingly, and thys ys apointed to be playd to-morrowe night at my

Lord of Southampton's, unless you send a wrytt to remove the *corpus cum causa* to your house in Strande. Burbage is my messenger ready attending your pleasure.”

Was one of that “kinde of creaturs,” then Southampton's bosom friend?

After Shakspeare's retirement to Stratford, in 1611, some respect was shewn to his wealth, but no honour to his dramatic talents. In the next year, 1612, the performance of all stage plays at Stratford was forbidden by the municipality under a penalty of £10. No notice seems to have been taken of his death in 1616, although some time before 1623 the monument, with its effusive epitaph, was erected, but by whom does not appear.

When Bacon died, and when Ben Jonson died, a host of elegies bewailed their loss.

It may be supposed that Francis Bacon used Shakspeare as his go-between with the theatre, and his scribes at Twickenham doubtless supplied the unblotted copies, which Heming and Condell in their simplicity admired. Shakspeare's fellow-players may have recognised in him the real or nominal author of the plays, without caring to enquire further. But Ben Jonson at least scoffed at his pretensions, well knowing that many of the plays were earlier than Shakspeare's theatrical career, and further, that he was incapable of such productions. This ambiguous position is expressed in Ben Jonson's epigram, to the “Poet Ape who would be thought our Chief,” which Sir Theodore Martin, and other Shakespearians, admit must refer to Shakspeare, as the only poet-actor who had gained wealth, and could claim pre-eminence; in it Ben Jonson dubbed him “a bold thief, and added:

“A first he made low shifts, would pick and glean,
Buy the reversion of old plays. Now grown

"The Comedy of Errors."

To a little wealth and credit in the scene,
He takes up all, makes each man's wit his own."

In 1623, the Shakespeare plays were collected and published in the Folio, under the auspices of Ben Jonson, who, at the same time, was, as we learn from Archbishop Tenison, Bacon's literary assistant. Bacon was petitioning the King for official employment, and could not disclose his authorship, which must remain veiled behind the name under which the plays had long been known.

To return to the *Comedy of Errors*. This play, as originally written, and twice acted before Elizabeth, was not written by William Shakspeare, of Stratford. If he afterwards revised the play, of which there is no evidence, he had no just title to call the play his own. The circumstances attending the third production of the play in 1594 appear to show that he did not claim to be the author, nor was recognised as such, nor indeed as the author of the Poems and Sonnets then already published.

The facts combine to point to Francis Bacon as the author of the play.

G. C. BOMPAS.

DELUSION and error do not perish by controversial warfare. They perish under the slow and silent operations of changes to which they are unable to adapt themselves.—EDWARD CLODD (Pioneers of Evolution).

NOTES, QUERIES, AND CORRESPONDENCE.

The Bi-Literal Cipher.

WE are happy to state that Mrs. Gallup has furnished the Bacon Society with the means of checking some of her deciphered work. She has been good enough to forward manuscripts of the complete italic text of *Henry VII.* (1622). The letters have been marked off into groups of five, of which each unit is assigned to A or B font.

The Council are taking steps for a complete and careful scrutiny, and the result will be made public with the least possible loss of time.

We greatly regret to hear that Mrs. Gallup has not yet recovered from the physical break-down which unhappily disabled her two years ago.

The Awakening of St. Albans.

IT is a satisfaction to record that the result of several successful meetings at St. Albans has been the formation of "The St. Albans Bacon Society for the Study of Elizabethan Literature." It is hoped that the Right Hon. the Earl of Verulam will accept the Presidentship. The inaugural meeting took place on Friday, March 4th, 1904, when Sir William Wasteneys occupied the chair; after the necessary business, Mrs. C. H. Ashdown delivered a Lecture upon "The Haunts and Homes of Francis Bacon," illustrated by the lantern, the major portion of the slides and also of the subject matter having been kindly furnished by Mrs. H. Pott.

The new Society has issued the following prospectus:—

THE ST. ALBANS BACON SOCIETY,
For the Study of Elizabethan Literature.

The objects of the Society are :—

1. To encourage the general study of literature, with special regard to the Elizabethan period.
2. To encourage the study of the works of Francis Bacon as philosopher, lawyer, statesman, and poet; also his character, genius, and life; his influence on his own and succeeding times; the tendencies and results of his writings, and his connection with St. Albans and its neighbourhood.
3. To study and investigate the works of Shakespeare, and their connection with contemporary drama; also to receive, discuss, and impartially consider, evidence relating to their authorship.
4. To found a library of Elizabethan literature in St. Albans dealing with the subjects enumerated above.
5. To encourage the visits of eminent students of Elizabethan literature to St. Albans, with a view to popular lectures, &c.
6. To afford assistance to the many visitors, English, foreign, and especially American, who annually visit the local places of interest associated with the name of Francis Bacon.

It will be seen from the preceding that the object in view is to found a Literary Society confined mainly to the Elizabethan period, the introduction of the Bacon-Shakespeare controversy giving the touch of opposition which is necessary to encourage critical research, while at the same time being desirable from the ever-increasing interest which it evokes.

At the same time the foundation of such a Society would remove the stigma which now rests upon St. Albans of "knowing nothing of its greatest man," for to many in the town Bacon is but a name, vaguely associated with Gorhambury and some system of philosophy. He says, "For my name and memory I leave it to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and the next ages" To Albanians this name and memory should be a precious heritage to be rescued at all hazards from the limbo of dull forgetfulness to which it has been locally relegated for many generations.

The leader of this admirable movement is Mr. C. H. Ashdown, the author of the standard "History of the City of St. Albans." His efforts have been energetically and ably seconded by Mr. J. M. Wood.

Lord Macaulay.

IN his lately-published work, "William Penn," by Augustus C. Buell, we find the following criticism of Macaulay, with reference to his remarks on "William Penn," and the "Maids of Taunton," in his "History of England":—

"As a model of English composition, Macaulay has no superior ; as a guide to the truth of history many equals ! He always wrote for an object—party and the peerage. He gained his ambition. Macaulay dearly loved a lord. But all his love was lavished upon live lords. He licked the hand that fed him—a good trait. He bit the hands that did not feed him. Occasionally he made a vicious snap at some hand, which, having once fed him, had quit. He wrote his 'History of England' to defame the Stuarts. This was not because he himself hated them, but because he knew that defamation of them would please the *régime* to which he must look for his peerage."

Mr. Buell evidently knows what he is writing about. One of Macaulay's *bêtes noires* was Bacon. Bacon was *not* a live lord, hence the slanders in the Essay on Bacon.

"A Change of Treatment."

FROM the ever-entertaining *Literary World*, March 4th, 1904 :—

"A reviewer of Mr. Churton Collins's 'Studies in Shakespeare' seems to think that the only way to kill the 'Baconian craze' is by the way of kindness. 'The truth is (he says) that an *idée fixe*, like the Baconian craze, will never yield to the methods of the bludgeon ; it needs a calmer and more persuasive style, more consciousness of the stronger points, few as they are, of the craze—in a word, more good temper and less excitement.' The 'Baconian craze' has certainly had a fair amount of bludgeoning. There may be something in the contention that a change of treatment is necessary."

We shall expectantly await the studied argument, the calmer, more persuasive style, hitherto so conspicuously lacking.

“Country Fruits.”

WITH reference to the passage in the “Epistle Dedicatorie” of the First Folio, “Country hands reach foorth milke, creame, fruits, or what they haue,” a correspondent sends us the following parallel from a letter from Bacon sent to Sir George Villiers, upon the sending his patent for Viscount Villiers to be signed.

“And now, because I am in the country, I will send you some of my country fruits ; which, with me, are good meditations ; which when I am in the city are choked with business.”

The remainder of the letter runs as follows :

“After that the King shall have watered your new dignities with his bounty of the lands which he intends you, and that some other things concerning your means which are now likewise in intention shall be settled upon you ; I do not see but you may think your private fortunes established ; and therefore it is now time that you should refer your actions chiefly to the good of your sovereign and your country. It is the life of an ox or beast always to eat, and never to exercise ; but men are born (and specially Christian men), not to cram in their fortunes, but to exercise their virtues ; and yet the other hath been the unworthy, and (thanks be to God) sometimes the unlucky humour of great persons in our times. Neither will your further fortune be the further off : for assure yourself that fortune is of a woman’s nature, that will sooner follow you by slighting than by too much wooing. And in this dedication of yourself to the public, I recommend unto you principally that what I think was never done since I was born ; and which not done hath bred almost a wilderness and solitude in the King’s service ; which is, that you countenance, and encourage, and advance able men and meriting men in all kinds, degrees, and professions. For in time of the Cecils, the father and the son, able men were by design and of purpose suppressed ; and though of late choice goeth better both in church and commonwealth, yet money, and turn-serving, and cunning canvasses, and importunity prevail too much. And in places of moment, rather make able and honest men yours, than advance those that are otherwise because they are yours. As for cunning and corrupt men, you must (I know), sometimes use them ; but keep them at a distance ; and let it appear that you make use of them, rather than that they lead you. Above all, depend wholly (next to God) upon the King ; and be ruled (as hitherto you have been) by his instructions ; for that is best for yourself. For the King’s care and thoughts concerning you

are according to the thoughts of a great king ; whereas your thoughts concerning yourself are and ought to be according to the thoughts of a modest man. But let me not weary you. The sum is, that you think goodness the best part of greatness ; and that you remember whence your rising comes, and make return accordingly. God ever keep you.

“Gorhambury, 1616.”

Honorificabilitudine.

A CORRESPONDENT informs us that he has found in “*Les Bigarrures et Touches du Seigneur des Accords* [pseudonym for *Estienne Tabourot*] avec les *Apophthegmes du Sieur Gaulard et les Escraignes Dijonnoises*,” a curious little work brimfull of Rebus, Anagrams, and similar allusive devices, in the 2nd edition, Paris, 1608, 12mo, Vol. I., p. 127, at the end of a chapter on Leonine Verses, this “*addition of another* : ”

“J’ay leu dans un vieil Legiste, barbare *quidem* à son parler, mais fort decisif, ce quatrain mignard, trousseé, veridique :

“Annis mille iam peractis
Nulla fides est in pactis,
Mel in ore, verba lactis,
Fel in corde, fraus in factis.”

This quatrain is almost identical with the one on the famous Northumberland MS., followed there by a sort of signature written by the same hand at the same time :

“Multis annis iam transactis,
Nulla fides est in pactis,
Mell in ore Verba lactis,
Fell in corde, ffraus in factis.
“Your lovinge
“ffrend,
“honorificabili(?)tudine.”

The same correspondent says that the last word is not, as commonly supposed by some Baconians, “honorificabilitudino.” The letter (italicized in the quotation above) after the *l* cannot be an *i*, for it looks in the MS. rather like a *c* or *e*, and has, moreover, no

dot. The last letter of the word is not an *o*, but an *e*, which may be readily seen by comparing it with the *o*'s and *e*'s of other words in the MS., for instance, of the word "*ore*" in the stanza. The examination of another contemporary handwriting showed the same difference between the letters *o* and *e*, the latter looking there, as here, like *o* with a little loop at the top.

This form of *e*, naturally misleading to anyone not familiar with Elizabethan handwritings, was very likely developed from the form *ε* by the peculiar manner in which this letter apparently was often made in the 16th and 17th centuries: first the lower half (the pen moving downward); then the upper half (the pen likewise moving downward). The rapid doing of these two separate curve movements would tend to keep the pen to the paper, and so to unite these two movements into one, which would in hasty or careless writing produce a figure intended for *e*, but looking so very much like an *o*. The upper curve would tend to become a *small* loop, because the pen was often carried rapidly from this letter right on to the next.

The correctness of this explanation will be evident to anyone who tries to write an *ε* rapidly a number of times as here described.

For these reasons the mock-latin word at the end of the above Latin quatrain is not "*honorificabilitudino*," and it does not, therefore, permit the anagrammatic interpretation given it by Dr. Isaac Hull Platt.

"The Praise of Shakespeare."*

THIS is an anthology of criticism in prose and verse; an excellent work for which Baconians and

*"The Praise of Shakespeare": an English Anthology, compiled by C. E. Hughes. With a preface by Sidney Lee Methuen and Co. 3s. 6d.

Shakesperians alike owe Mr. C. E. Hughes a debt of gratitude.

The first flower in Mr. Hughes's garland is from Meres's *Palladis Tamia*, the last from Judge Willis's "Trial at Bar." Why this last lengthy and farcical quotation is honoured by a place in an otherwise dignified and well chosen selection we cannot say. The book is admittedly a missile aimed at Baconian heads, and we can only surmise that having ransacked the world of literature Mr. Hughes deems Judge Willis to be the most potent and irresistible writer in the Shakespearian ranks.

The book is vouched by a preface from the pen of Mr. Sidney Lee. It displays the facile assurance and the authentic style which we are wont to associate with the name of this writer.

Bacon-Shakespeare Pamphlets.

ARRANGEMENTS are in progress for the issue of a series of pamphlets, which will present in a concise and uncontroversial form the main features of the Baconian theory. A second series, refuting the inaccuracies and misstatements of prominent critics, is likewise in preparation.

The first number of this series is already in the press and will be ready shortly. It is a revised and enlarged reprint of Mr. Stronach's recent article in *The Pall Mall Magazine*, "A Critic Criticised: Mr. Sidney Lee and the Baconians."

A Parallel.

A CORRESPONDENT draws our attention to the following parallel:—

I'll ride in golden armour like the sun ;

And in my helm a triple plume shall spring,
 Spangled with diamonds, dancing in the air,
 To note me Emperor of the three-fold world;
 Like to an almond-tree y-mounted high
 Upon the lofty and celestial mount
 Of ever-green Selimus, quaintly deck'd
 With blooms more white than Erycina's brows,
 Whose tender blossoms tremble every one
 At every little breath that thorough heaven is blown.

MARLOWE (*Tamburlaine II.*, Act IV., Sc. 3).

* * * * *

Upon the top of all his loftie crest,
 A bounch of heares discoloured diversly,
 With sprinckled pearle and gold full richly drest,
 Did shake, and seem'd to daunce for iollity;
 Like to an almond-tree ymounted hye
 On top of greene Selinis all alone,
 With blossoms brave bedeckéd daintily;
 Whose tender locks do tremble every one
 At everie little breath that under heaven is blowne.

SPENSER (*Fairy Queen*, B. I., C. vii., St. 32).

The above passages both appeared in print for the first time in the same year, 1590.

Freedom of the Press.

MR. C. Y. C. DAWBARN draws our attention to the following proclamation. It was issued in the year 1585 :—*

"Whereas dyvers bokes filled bothe with heresy, sediton, and treason, have of late, and be dayly broughte into thys Realme out of foreine countries and places beyond the seas, and some also covertly printed within this Realme and caste abroad in sundrye partes thereof, whereby not only God is dishonoured,

* Arber Reprints, vol. i., p. 92.

but also an encouragemente geven to disobey lawfull princes and governors. The Kyng and Queenes majesties for redresse hereof by this their present proclamation declare and publishe to all their subjectes that whosoever shall after the proclaymyng hereof be founde to have any of the sayde wycked and seditious boke, or finding them doo not forthwith burne the same, without showing or reading the same to any other person, shall in that case be reputed and taken for a rebel, and shall without delay be executed for that offence according to the order of marshall lawe. Given, &c.

"God save the Kyng and the Quene."

As late as 1583 two men were hanged in Suffolk for the sole offence of distributing a work by Robert Brown, the would-be ecclesiastical reformer.

Wanted Facts.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In your January number, Mr. Theobald asks what is the *Quatuor Coronati*, and where obtainable?

The "*Quatuor Coronati*" is the name of the Masonic Lodge, No. 2076. It has published reprints of several masonic manuscripts, and also publishes a magazine entitled "*Ars Quatuor Coronati*."

FRA. J. BURGOYNE.

Tate Library, Brixton.

The Perplexity of "The Literary World."

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

It is interesting to learn, on the authority of *The Literary World*, that M. Guillaume Apollinaire takes for granted the pseudonymic character of the name "William Shakespeare."

Writing in *L'Européen* on the tercentenary of Cervantes, he begins what he has to say as follows:—

"On the 23rd April, 1616, there died an obscure English actor named Shekspere, to whom, on account of the similarity of the names, people afterwards attributed the works of a more illustrious unknown, who signed himself 'William Shakespeare.'"

Considering the facts of history as they have come down to us, this reads like sound commonsense, yet *The Literary World* naïvely remarks, "We do not understand why M. Apollinaire should start his article with this extraordinary paragraph." One

would have thought, after all that has been written on the subject, that an explanation might at least have suggested itself.

HELEN STEWART.

John Aubrey.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In the October number of *BACONIANA*, in the article "Shakespeare Reminiscences," there are one or two points in the way of slips and misapprehensions, which you will, perhaps, allow me to draw attention to, as I have not seen any reference to them in the January number.

Mr. Hutchinson, the writer of the article, says, "that very soon after 1630 John Aubrey visited Stratford-on-Avon." What I would ask to be allowed to point out is that, so far as I can find, there is absolutely no direct evidence that Aubrey ever visited Stratford at all. Writers on Shakespeare all seem to make the statement that he *did*. Halliwell-Phillipps, for example, speaks of him visiting Stratford on one of his equestrian journeys, and so with the other authorities. But I am quite unable to find whence they get their fact, apart from Aubrey's statement in his "Life" that he had "been told heretofore by some of the neighbours that when he was a boy he exercised his father's trade." Certainly these words would commonly be taken to imply that Aubrey had visited Stratford, but there is no indication that I can find in Britton's "Memoir of John Aubrey," that he ever was there.

The notes which constitute Aubrey's "Lives," were written about 1680. They appear to have been written very hastily, in the year or years immediately preceding that date, and more or less worked over subsequently. We must take them as they are. Aubrey himself describes them as "these Minutes of Lives" put in writing, "tumultuarily, as they occurred to my thoughts." Thus the notes, such as they are, cannot rank very highly as biography or biographical material. Still, they have a distinct value of their own, and I think the contemptuous manner in which Halliwell-Phillipps alludes to them in his "Outlines" is very unjust and very improper. He calls Aubrey a foolish and detestable gossip. Aubrey was a scholar, a man of wide culture and sympathies, a distinguished antiquary and topographer, sagacious as well as industrious, and a Fellow of the Royal Society. Whatever may be the shortcomings of his writings, it is not seemly to stigmatise such a man as a foolish and detestable gossip.

When Mr. Hutchinson spoke of Aubrey's "Peregrinations round Stratford, sometime about 1642," he was, perhaps, misled by his recollection of the mention of that date in the notes about Shakespeare, where Aubrey, referring to the village constable

at Grendon, in Buckinghamshire, says, "And there was living that constable about 1642, when I first came to Oxon." In that year Aubrey was 16 years old, and was entered at Trinity College, Oxford.

This point of Aubrey's visiting Stratford is both interesting and important, and it would be a useful service if anyone would produce direct evidence that he did make such a visit. It is in the belief that no such evidence exists that I have written this note, in order to draw attention to the point.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

A. HASTINGS WHITE.

A Hamlet Amendment.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR, — May I draw your attention to a misreading of Shakespeare? It has been curiously overlooked by commentators. Polonius, in reading Hamlet's letter [Act II., Sc. ii.], says, in modern editions, "beautified Opelia is a *vile* phrase." The folio of 1623 gives it as *viled* phrase, quite another thing. In John Spencer's *Promus*, or "Storehouse of Similes," printed at Sion College, MDCLVIII. occurs this passage, "The Scripture . . . whence may be gathered . . . phrases to polish our speeches with . . . far above all *filed* phrases of human elocution."

Again, in Todd's edition of Samuel Johnson's Dictionary [1827], we find under *File*, "There hath flourished in England so fine and *filed* phrases . . . as may countervayle the doings of Virgil, Ovid, etc." Todd says Johnson gives Shakespeare as using the word in this sense without reference.

In our Baconian edition of the Plays this error should be corrected.

Yours truly,

ALICIA A. LEITH.

Hampstead.

LIST OF WORDS OMITTED ON PAGE 58 OF PRECEDING ISSUE.

ACADEME, Accite, Acknown, Admiration, Advertising, Aggravate, Argentine (in the spurious Play, *Pericles*), Artificial, Aspersion. Cacodæmon, Capricious, Captious, Cast, Casual, Circumscribe, Civil, Collect, Collection, Comfort, Complement, Composition, Composure, Compound, Concert, Conduce, Conduct, Confine, Confineless, Confix, Congruent, Consign, Consist, Contain, Content, Continent, Contraction, Contrive, Conveniences, Convent, Conversation, Convince, Crescive, Crisp. Decimation, Defused, Degenerate, Deject, Delated, Delation, Demerits, Demise, Depend, Deprave, Derogate, Derogation, Determine,

Determinate, Determination, Discoloured, Dissemble, Distrust, Distraction, Document, Double. Eminent, Epitheton, Err, Errant, Erring, Evitate, Exempt, Exhaust, Exhibition, Exigent, Expedient, Expedition, Expostulate, Expulsed, Exsufficate, Extenuate, Extirp, Extracting. Facinorous, Fact, Fatigate, Fine, Fraction, Frustrate. Glory, Gratulate, Immanity, Imposed, Impose, Imposition, Incense, Incertain, Include, Indigent, Indign, Indubitate, Inequality, Inform, Infortunat, Inhabitable, Inherit, Inheritor, Insisture, Insisting, Instance, Instant, Intend, Intensively. Lethe. Mere, Merely, Merit, Modesty. Occident, Officious. Paint, Painted, Palliament, Perdition, Perdurable, Periapt, Permission, Perpend, Person, Pervert, Plant, Plausibly, Port, Portable, Prefer, Preposterous, Prevent, Probation, Propension, Recordation, Reduce, Refelled, Religious, Remonstrance, Reneg, Replete, Repugn, Repugnancy, Repute, Rivage, Ruinate. Scope, Secure, Security, Seen, Segregation, Semblable, Sensible, Septentrions, Simular, Solemn, Sort, Substitute, Success. Tenable, Terms, Translate. Umber'd.

Postscript.

MR. J. CHURTON COLLINS' *Studies in Shakespeare* will be dealt with in the following number. It is regrettable that so able a writer should disfigure his work by vituperative vulgarity.

In the March Number of the *Pall Mall Magazine*, Mr. George Moore avows his belief that "for purely poetical reasons" Bacon adopted as a pseudonym "the sweet illusive pen name" of Shakespeare.

The March Number of *Broad Views* contains an anti-Shakespearian article entitled "The Great Stratford Superstition." This is to be followed by other articles from alternate sides.

The American Monthly, *The Open Court* for January and February, contains excellent articles negating the possibility of the play-actor Shaksper being the author Shakespeare. Neither writer is at present prepared to accept Bacon as the authentic Shakespeare, but a little further investigation will doubtless bring both to that assured conviction that is born of doubt. *Broad Views* and *The Open Court* are published by Kegan Paul & Co., Ltd.

Reviews of *Shakespeare Still Enthroned* (Rowland's), and *The History of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Mathew* (Mathew) are held over until the following Number.